



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 12]

हर्दि विल्सो, शनिवार, मार्च 22, 1980/चैत्र 2, 1902

No 12] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1980/CHAITRA 2, 1902

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या की जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यकाल प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए समिक्षिक सांबेद और साधित्यनाम।

Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आवेदन

हर्दि विल्सो, 28 जनवरी, 1980

कांस्ट्रॉ. 647.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कनटिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 10-गुलबार्गा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री वीरेश्वर काङडगांधी, मकान नं. 1-552, स्टेनेट बागर, जिला गुलबर्गा, गुलबर्गा-585102 (कनटिक राज्य) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रतिनियम, 1951 तथा नवधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा घोषित प्रमाणे निर्वाचन व्यवों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में अमरक्षम रहे हैं;

अतः यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएं दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण घोषवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी भयानक हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यावीचित्र नहीं है;

अतः यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएं दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण घोषवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी भयानक हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यावीचित्र नहीं है।

[सं. कर्ना०-वि०ग०/10/78(14)]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA ORDERS

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1980

S.O. 647.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Veeranna Kadganchi, H. No. 1-552, Station Bagar, Gulbarga District, Gulbarga-585102 (Karnataka State), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 78 from 10-Gulbarga assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Veeranna Kadganchi to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/10/78(14)]

कांस्ट्रॉ. 648.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कनटिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 57-दमकुर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एम०ए०. हर्ष गोवदा सुपुर्ह होशायर्गंगे गोवदा, प्रथम मैन रोड, सोमेश्वरपुरम्, हमल्लूर-2 (कनटिक) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रतिनियम, 1951 द्वारा

तद्विन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा घोषित, जगते निर्वाचन वर्गों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचल नहीं है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एकदृश्य उक्त श्री एक०एक०हृष्ण गोदाको संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अधिवास विधान परिषद के संघर्ष जुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारेश को तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाचन घोषित करता है।

[सं. कर्मा०-विंस० 57/78(15)]

S.O. 648.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri S. H. Krishnegowda, S/o. Honnagangegowda, Int Main Road, Someshwarapuram, Tumkur-2 (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February 1978 from 57-Tumkur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri S. H. Krishnegowda to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/57/78(15)]

कांस्था० 649.—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि कारवारी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए सावधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194-बैलहोंगल सभा निर्वाचन-झेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कल्लनगौडा हनमंगोदा पाटिल, संख्या० 406, बुदर कट्टी, तालुक बैलगोंगल, जिला बेलगाम (कर्नाटक), सोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्विन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा घोषित जगते निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचल नहीं है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एकदृश्य उक्त श्री येत्तिनमानी बासपा कलिङ्गपा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अधिवास विधान परिषद के संघर्ष जुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारेश को तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाचन घोषित करता है।

[सं. कर्मा०-विंस०/194/78 (16)]

S.O. 649.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kallanagouda Hanamangouda Patil, H. No. 406. Budar Katti, Taluk Bailnangal, District Belgaum (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 194-Bailnangal Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kallanagouda Hanamangouda Patil to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/194/78(16)]

कांस्था० 650.—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि कारवारी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए सावधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194-बैलहोंगल सभा निर्वाचन-झेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री येत्तिनमानी बासपा कलिङ्गपा, संख्या० 378, नेशरी, तालुक बैलहोंगल, जिला बेलगाम (कर्नाटक), सोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्विन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा घोषित अपने व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचल नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त आयोग की धारा 10के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एकदृश्य उक्त श्री येत्तिनमानी बासपा कलिङ्गपा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अधिवास विधान परिषद के संघर्ष जुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारेश को तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाचन घोषित करता है।

[सं. कर्मा०-विंस०/194/78(17)]

S.O. 650.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Yettinamani Basappa Kalingappa, H. No. 378, Nersagi, Taluka Bailhongal, District Belgaum (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 194-Bailhongal Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Yettinamani Basappa Kalingappa to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/194/78(17)]

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवारी, 1980

कांस्था० 651.—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि कारवारी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए सावधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 25-मिठ्ठानूर सभा निर्वाचन-झेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री संगमा करीबसाम्या, सारंगपात्र मठ, संख्या० 100, तालुक दिंदूळ, जिला रायबूर (कर्नाटक) सोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्विन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा घोषित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिए गए अस्पष्टावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि

उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या स्थानीयित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उसके प्रधानियम के पांच 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन प्राप्तये एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री संगाया कारिबासाया का संसद के लिये भी उक्त के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस अदेश को तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित प्रतिष्ठित करता है।

[सं० कर्ना०-विं०म०/25/78(18)]

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1980

S.O. 651.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sangayya Karibassaya, Sarganachar Math, Post-Taluk Sindhanoor District Raichur (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 25-Sindhanoor constituency, has failed to lodge any account for his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sangayya Karibassaya to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/25/78(18)]

का०प्रा० 652.—यतः, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह समाप्त हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कन्टिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 40-हरिहर सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ए० ए० शुभानूर, समादक, न्यायवादी दैनिक समाचार पत्र, पौ० न० रोड, दावनगर, जिला चित्रदुर्ग (कन्टिक), लंक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधानियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी अंदर वालिक करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएं दिये जाने पर भी अपने इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रधान प्रधान स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, ओर, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह भी समाप्त हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई प्रतीक्षा कारण या स्थानीयित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उसके प्रधानियम की द्वारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन प्राप्तये एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री ए० गुरुलिंगप्पा को संसद के लिये भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस अदेश को तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित प्रतिष्ठित करता है।

[सं० कर्ना०-विं०म०/40/78(19)]

S.O. 652.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri B. Gurulingappa, S/o. Basappa, Halladakere, Harihar P.O. District Chitradurga (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February 1978 from 40-Harihar Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri B. Gurulingappa to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/40/78(19)]

का०प्रा० 653.—यतः, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाप्त हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कन्टिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 41-दावनगर सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ए० ए० शुभानूर, समादक, न्यायवादी दैनिक समाचार पत्र, पौ० न० रोड, दावनगर, जिला चित्रदुर्ग (कन्टिक), लंक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधानियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित आपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएं दिये जाने पर भी अपने इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, ओर, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह भी समाप्त हो गया है कि उसके पास श्री अदेश के लिए कोई प्रतीक्षा कारण या स्थानीयित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उसके प्रधानियम की द्वारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन प्राप्तये एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री ए० ए० शुभानूर की संसद के लिये भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस अदेश को तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित प्रतिष्ठित करता है।

[म० कर्ना०-विं०म०/41/78(20)]

3.O. 653.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri N. B. Bhushanur, Editor, Nyayavadi Daily Newspaper, P. B. Road, Davangere, District Chitradurga (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 41-Davangere Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri N. B. Bhushanur to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order,

[No. KT-LA/41/78(20)]

का०प्रा० 654.—यतः, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाप्त हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कन्टिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 193-गारसगड़ सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गोदिकर रेडी राम रेडी मेट्ट, जार्खीतान, न० पारमगड़ जिला वेनगाम (कन्टिक) लंक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधानियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित आपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी नेतृत्व दर्शित करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचनाएं दिये जाने पर भी अपने इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, ओर, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह भी समाप्त हो गया है कि उसके

पात्र इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकारण नहीं है;

यतः प्रब्र, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के भनुसरण में निर्बचित प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गोविन्द रेही राम रेही मेटी की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रायोग की तारीख से तीन घंटे की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० कर्ना०-विं० स०/193/78 (21)]

S.O. 654.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Govindaraddi Ramaraddi Meti, Hanchinal, Taluka Parasgad, District Belgaum (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka, Legislative Assembly held in February, 78 from 193-Parasgad assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Govindaraddi Ramaraddi Meti, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/193/78(21)]

का० आ० ६५५.—यतः, निर्बचित प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कनाटिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बचित के लिए 198-उचांगांव सभा निर्बचित-सेक्षन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कोल्हापुरी मोहन यशवन्त, श्री० सी० म० ११, फोर्ट कल्याणमें, जिला, बेलगाम, बेलगाम (कनाटिक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा प्रयोगित अपने निर्बचित व्ययों का कोई भी सेवा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

योर, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्बचित प्रायोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकारण नहीं है;

यतः, प्रब्र, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के भनुसरण में निर्बचित प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कोल्हापुरी मोहन यशवन्त की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रायोग की तारीख से तीन घंटे की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० कर्ना०-विं० स०/198/78(22)]

S.O. 655.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kolhapuri Mohan Yeshwant, B.C. No. 11, Fort Contonment, Belgaum District, Belgaum (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 78 from 198-Uchangaon assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kolhapuri Mohan Yeshwant to be disqualified for

being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/198/78(22)]

का० आ० ६५६.—यतः, निर्बचित प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कनाटिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बचित के लिए 213-बागलकोट निर्बचित-सेक्षन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अशोक राघवेन्द्रराव देसाई, माफूल श्री० श्री० वेसाई, गाजनन काली जोशी बिलिंग, नवापाडा, बिल्लू नगर दोम्बीवली, परिनमी थाना जिला, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए नए नियमों द्वारा प्रयोगित अपने निर्बचित व्ययों का कोई भी सेवा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

योर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्बचित प्रायोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकारण नहीं है;

यतः, प्रब्र, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के भनुसरण में निर्बचित प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अशोक राघवेन्द्रराव देसाई की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रायोग की तारीख से तीन घंटे की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० कर्ना० विं० स०/213/78(23)]

S.O. 656.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ashok Raghavendrarao Desai, C/o. Shri V. R. Desai, Gajanana Kally Joshi Building, Navapade, Vishnugad, Dombivelli, West Thana District, a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 213-Bagalkot Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ashok Raghavendrarao Desai to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/213/78(23)]

नई विल्सनी, 12 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० ६५७.—यतः, निर्बचित प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कनाटिक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बचित के लिए 134-प्रकुलगुड सभा निर्बचित-सेक्षन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एरोवदा मुमुक्षु वासव गोवारा हीरेवेसागृषी, पी० डम्ब्लू० श्री० कालोनी, कालबनकोट पोस्ट, होमेनसीपुर तालुक, जिला हसम (कनाटिक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए नए नियमों द्वारा प्रयोगित अपने निर्बचित व्ययों का कोई भी सेवा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

योर, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और

निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकार्य नहीं है ;

अतः प्रब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री प्रेमेश्वर को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान अधिकार विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है ।

[सं० कर्न० विंस०/134/78(24)]

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1980

S.O. 657.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Eregowda S/o. Basavegowda, Hirebelaguli, P.W.D. Colony, Kadavanakote Post, Holenarsipur Taluk, District Hassan (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 134-Arkalgud Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Eregowda to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/134/78(24)]

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1980

का० ३० आ० ६५८.—यतः, निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में एउट कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचित के लिए 61-टरुवेकरे सभा निर्वाचित-क्षेत्र से छनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री को० एन० एन० मूर्खी मार्फत के० एन० नागराज, झूनियर इंजीनियर, अस्मासानद्वा फैक्ट्री, तुरुवेकरे लालनक, दुमकुर जिला (कर्नाटक) सोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 नथा नदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित भावने निर्वाचित व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पर्क मूल्यनार्थ दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार अपार्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकार्य नहीं है ;

अतः प्रब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री के० एन० एन० मूर्खी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है ।

[सं० कर्न० विंस० स०/61/78(25)]

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1980

S.O. 658.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri K. N. N. Murthy, C/o. K. N. Nagaraj, Junior Engineer, Ammasandra Factory, Turuvekere Taluk, Tumkur District (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in

February, 1978 from 61-Turuvekere Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri K. N. Murthy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/61/78(25)]

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 1980

का० ३० ६५९.—यतः, निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में एउट कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचित के लिए 176-हुबली सभा निर्वाचित-क्षेत्र से छनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मोदिनाथ मोहम्मद यूसुफ, कोनकानी भलदार श्रीनी, हुबली, जिला धारवाड़, (कर्नाटक), सोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 नथा नदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचित व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पर्क मूल्यनार्थ दिये जाने पर अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार अपार्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकार्य नहीं है ;

अतः प्रब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री मोदिनाथ मोहम्मद यूसुफ को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन बर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है ।

[सं० कर्न० विंस० स०/176/78(28)]

New Delhi, the 20th February, 1980

S.O. 659.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Modinsab Mohammad Yusuf, Konakanai Maldar Oni, Hubli, Dharwad District (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 176-Hubli Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Modinsab Mohammad Yusuf to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/176/78(28)]

का० प्रा० 660.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग या समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 176-हुंडी सभा निर्वाचन-सेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री इतागी विक्रम वेदामूर्थी, नेताजी पर्याप्त आफ्सिस, पेंडगली गांव (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा नट्हीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित गीति में अपने निवाचनों का लेखा वाचिक करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पर्क सूचनाएँ दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अख्यात स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या आवैधिक नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री इतागी विक्रम वेदामूर्थी जो संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष भी कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० कर्ना०-वि० स०/176/78(29)]

S.O. 660.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Itagi Vikram Vedamurthy, Netaji Paper Office, Pendgallli, Hubli (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 176-Hubli Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Itagi Vikram Vedamurthy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/176/78(29)]

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 661.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 182-हिरेकेरूर सभा निर्वाचन-सेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कृष्णेलूर अन्धुलरज़ू (दीशानगार), कोइ नामुक, हिरेकेरूर (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा नट्हीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन धर्यों का कोई भी लेखा वाचिक करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पर्क सूचनाएँ दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अख्यात स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या आवैधिक नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कृष्णेलूर अन्धुलरज़ू दीशानगार को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष भी कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० कर्ना०-वि० स०/182/78(30)]

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

S.O. 661.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kuppelur Abdulrajak Divansab, Kod, Taluk, Horekerur (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 182-Hirekerur Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kuppelur Abdulrajak Divansab to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/182/78(30)]

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 662.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग या समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 216-हुंगूंड सभा निर्वाचन-सेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कथानी बागपा गढ़ीयपा, स० व प० हडगली, तालुक हुंगूंड, जिला गोआपुर (कर्नाटक) जोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा नट्हीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन धर्यों का कोई भी लेखा वाचिक करने में असफल रहे हैं;

अतः अब, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अस्माविदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या आवैधिक नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कथानी बागपा गढ़ीयपा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष भी कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० कर्ना०-वि० स०/216/78(35)]

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

S.O. 662.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kathani Basappa Gaviyappa, At and Post Hadagali, Taluk Hangund, District Bijapur (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 216-Hungund constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kathani Basappa Gaviyappa to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/216/78(35)]

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1980

कांगड़ा० 663.—यतः, निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निवाचित के लिये 117-मुद्दांचयरों सभा निवाचित-स्क्रेन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री शोभाना कांगड़ा, बालान, टी० नरसिपुरा तालुक, जिला मैसूर (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा प्रवेशित समय के अवधि भवा रीति से अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का लेखा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्मत घृत्या दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अभ्यास लालीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी गमाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10-के अनुमति द्वारा 10-के अनुमति द्वारा उक्त श्री शोभाना को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अभ्यास विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भारतीय की सारीज्ञ से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० कर्न०-विंस०/117/78(38)]

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1980

S.O. 663.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Somiah, S/o Basava Naika, Vatal, T. Narasipura Taluk, District Mysore (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 117-Chamundeswari Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Somiah to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/117/78(38)]

कांगड़ा० 664.—यतः, निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निवाचित के लिये 124-कृष्णगांगानार सभा निवाचित-स्क्रेन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री माटी गोडा पुत्र श्री शोभानाहल्ली कोपाल, गन्धानाहल्ली, पो० क० आर० नगर नामुक, जिला मैसूर (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा प्रवेशित अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्मत सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अभ्यास स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी गमाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10-के अनुमति में निवाचित आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री शोभानाहल्ली को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अभ्यास विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भवित्व की सारीज्ञ से तीन वर्ष के सदस्य

भुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भारतीय की सारीज्ञ से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० कर्न०-विंस०/124/78(39)]

S.O. 664.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sathigowda, S/o Shri Sannatamegowda, Beechannahalli Koppal, Gandhanahalli P.O., K. R. Nagar Taluk, District Mysore, (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 124-Krishnarajanagar Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sathigowda to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/124/78(39)]

कांगड़ा० 665.—यतः, निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निवाचित के लिये 173-हनियास सभा निवाचित-स्क्रेन से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रान अब्दुल रहमान हसनसाब, महामंडी, एम०पी०सी० एम्पालाइज शूनियत, अब्दिका नगर, दानवेली, उत्तर कांगड़ा (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा प्रवेशित अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्मत सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अभ्यास स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी गमाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यापीचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10-के अनुमति द्वारा 173-हनियास सभा निवाचित-स्क्रेन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अभ्यास विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भवित्व की सारीज्ञ से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० कर्न०-विंस०/173/78(40)]

S.O. 665.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ron Abdul Rahiman Hasansab, General Secretary, M.P.C., Employees Union, Ambikanagar, Dandeli, Uttara Kannada (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 173-Haliyal Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ron Abdul Rahiman Hasansab to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/173/78(40)]

कांग्रेस 666.—यतः— निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए कर्नाटक विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 179-कुन्डगोल सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री हरिजन यमानप्पा यामाप्पा, मुंबई पो. मन्त्रीगांव तालुक, कुन्डगोल (कर्नाटक), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रतिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वितीय बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अनोखा अपने निर्वाचन व्याप्ति का छोर्द श्री लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकिय नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री हरिजन यमानप्पा यामाप्पा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष का कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं. कर्ना-वि०म०-179/78(41)]

S.O. 666.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Harijan Yamanappa Basappa, At P.O. Mattigatti Taluk, Kundgol, (Karnataka), a contesting candidate for general election to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 179-Kundgol Assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Harijan Yamanappa Basappa to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. KT-LA/179/78(41)]

नई दिल्ली, 1 मार्च, 1980

कांग्रेस 667.—यतः— निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि फरवरी, 1978 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 202-विकाराव (प्र०जा०) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव सड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री चन्द्रश्याम, पुत्र शिवश्या, निवासी तिदनुर, वैगा (गाँव), तालुक विकारावाद, रंगा रेण्टी जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वितीय बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा प्रतिनिधित्व समय के अन्वर समय रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्याप्ति का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकिय नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री चन्द्रश्याम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं. आ०प्र०-वि०म०/202/78(54)]

एस० सी० जैन, अवर सचिव,

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

New Delhi, the 1st March, 1980

S.O. 667.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chandriah, S/o Shiviah, r/o Siddulooi Paiga (Village), Vakarabad Taluk, Ranga Reddy Dist. (Andhra Pradesh) a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in February, 1978 from 202-Vikarabad (SC) Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chandriah to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/202/78(54)]

S. C. JAIN, Under Secy.
Election Commission of India

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 1980

कांग्रेस 668.—यतः— निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 147-कविरीथी सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सचिन नाग, 4/3 भूकलाश रोड, कलकत्ता-23 लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वितीय बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा घोषित प्रपने निर्वाचन व्याप्ति का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीकिय नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री सचिन नाग को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस भावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं. प०जा०-वि०म०/147/77]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th February, 1980

S.O. 668.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sachin Nag, 4/3 Bhukailash Road, Calcutta-23, a contesting candidate for general election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 147-Kabitirtha assembly constituency, held in June, 1977, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sachin Nag, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/147/77]

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० ६६९।—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग, दिल्ली प्रशासन के प्रमाण से श्री गृहन धी० कौशर, के रथान पर, श्री शारांको० आहुजा, आई०ए०ए०ग० उपायक, दिल्ली को उनके कार्यमार्ग नंभालने की तारीख से और अगले आठदिनों तक दिल्ली संघ गज्य थेट्र के मृण निर्वाचन आकिम के रूप में एनडब्ल्यू नामनिर्देशन करता है।

[सं० 154/दिल्ली/८०]
श्री० नागसुब्रामण्यन, सचिव,
भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1980

S.O. 669।—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Delhi Administration hereby nominates Shri R. K. Ahooja, I.A.S. Deputy Commissioner, Delhi as the Chief Electoral Officer for the Union Territory of Delhi with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders vice Shri N. C. Kochhar.

[No. 154/DJ /80]
V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.
Election Commission of India

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० ६७०।—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 115-गमगंजमंडी निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मोहन सिंह, एडवोकेट, बाजार नं० 6, गमगंज मंडी, कोटा (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इग असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यू उक्त श्री मोहन सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/115/77(42)]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 26th February, 1980

S.O. 670।—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mohan Singh, Advocate, Bazar No. 6, Ramganjmandi, Kota (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 115-Ramganjmandi constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mohan Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the

Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/115/77(42)]

का० आ० ६७१।—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 111-बारन निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री छित्तर लाल, मुपुत्र श्री छत्ता, आयत फैस्टरी, लाला, जिला कोटा (राजस्थान) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यू उक्त श्री छित्तर लाल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/111/77 (43)]

S.O. 671।—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chittar Lal, S/o Shri Chatra, Oil Factory, Baran, District Kota (Rajasthan) a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan House of the People/Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 111-Baran constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chittar Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/111/77(43)]

का० आ० ६७२।—यह, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 167-सिरोही निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ब्रजमोहन परिहार, रेवाड़ा, तहसील शिवांग (राजस्थान) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यू उक्त श्री ब्रजमोहन परिहार को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/167/77 (44)]

S.O. 672.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Brij Mohan Parihar, Rewada, Tehsil Sheogarh, (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan House of the People/Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 167-Sirohi constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Brij Mohan Parihar to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/167/77(44)]

का० आ० 673 :—यतः, निवाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचन के लिए 64-पानागाजी निवाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कैलाशचन्द्र, याम व पोस्ट नंगलबानी, तहसील-पानागाजी, जिला भूलधर (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा बालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निवाचन प्रायोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की घारा 10के अनुसरण में निवाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कैलाशचन्द्र को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०वि०स०/64/77(45)]

S.O. 673.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kailash Chandra, Village and P.O. Nangalbani, Tehsil Thanagazi, District-Alwar, (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 64-Thanagazi constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kailash Chandra to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/64/77(45)]

नई बिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 674 :—यतः, निवाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचन के लिए 16-झुंगरगढ़ निवाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री भैवरलाल गोदारा दुकरियासर, मार्फत श्री नेपाराम भंवर लाल

गोदारा, याम व डाकखाना—टुकरियासर, यामा मोमासर, जिला चुरू (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा बालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निवाचन प्रायोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की घारा 10के अनुसरण में निवाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री भैवरलाल गोदारा दुकरियासर को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश भी तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०वि०स०/16/77(46)]

New Delhi, the 28th February, 1980

S.O. 674.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Bhanwar Lal Godara Thukariasar, C/o Shri Nopa Ram Bhanwar Lal Godara, Village and P.O. Thukariasar via Momasar, District Churu (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan House of the People/Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 16-Dungargarh constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Bhanwar Lal Godara to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/16/77(46)]

का० आ० 675 :—यतः, निवाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए सम्यक प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचन के लिए 177-बैहर निवाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री महिपाल सिंह नवल सिंह, पो० ग्रो-पिनिवा (फन्डही), तहसील बैहर, जिला-बालाधाट (मध्य प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निवाचन व्ययों का लेखा बालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निवाचन प्रायोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की घारा 10के अनुसरण में निवाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री महिपाल सिंह नवल सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० म० प्र०वि०स०/177/77]

S.O. 675.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mahipal Singh, Nawal Singh, Village Kiniva, P.O. Kiniva (Kandui) Tehsil Baihar, District Balaghat (Madhya Pradesh), a contesting candidate for general election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 177-Baihar constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the

Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mahipal Singh Nawal Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/177/77]

नई दिल्ली, 3 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 676 —यतः, केन्द्रीय निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 10-पीली बगा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव महंगे वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मुलानान, पुत्र मुलचाराम, मो० बड़ोपस्थ, तहसील मूरशगढ़ (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीकात्व नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुमरण में निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा उक्त श्री मुलानान, पुत्र मुलचाराम को भंगद के किमी भी सदत के या किमी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के मद्दस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन घर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/10/77(48)]

New Delhi, the 3rd March, 1980

S.O. 676.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sultan, S/o Shri Tulcha Ram, R/o Badoupal, Tehsil, Suratgarh (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan House of the People/Legislative Assembly held in June 1977, from 10-Pillibangan constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sultan, S/o Shri Tulcha Ram, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/10/77(48)]

का० आ० 677 :—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 10-पीलीबंगा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव महंगे वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बनवारीलाल धनुका, पुत्र श्री लंबणगम धनुका, ग्राम पीलीबंगा (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और

निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीकात्व नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुमरण में निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा उक्त श्री बनवारीलाल धनुका जो संसद के किसी भी सदत के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन घर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/10/77(49)]

S.O. 677.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Banwari Lal Dhanuka, S/o Shri Lakh Ram Dhanuka, R/o Pillibangan, (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 10-Pillibangan constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Banwari Lal Dhanuka to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/10/77(49)]

का० आ० 678 :—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 30-फैटेहपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव महंगे वाले उम्मीदवार श्री डोलाराम, प्राम सरदारपुरा, पो० मंडेला बाड़ा, रास्ता फैटेहपुर (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण न्यायीकात्व नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुमरण में निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा उक्त श्री डोलाराम को संसद के किसी भी सदत के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन घर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० स०/30/77(50)]

S.O. 678.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Dola Ram, Village Sardarpura, P.O. Mandela Bara, via Fatehpur (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 30-Fatehpur constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Dola Ram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and

for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/30/77(50)]

का० आ० 679.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 30-फतेहपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बैनी, वाडे नं. 2, फतेहपुर शेखवाती, जिला सीकर (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, समयकृत मूल्यांक दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथमा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री बैनी को संगद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथमा विधान परिषद् के मदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख में तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० भ०/30/77(51)]

S.O. 679.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Beni, Ward No. 2, Fatehpur, Shekhawati, District Sikar, (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 30-Fatehpur constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Beni to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/30/77(51)]

नई दिल्ली, 5 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 680.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 123-कपासन निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मांगीलाल, मांडपिया, तहसील भेवसर, जिला चिंतीरगढ़ (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, समयकृत मूल्यांक दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथमा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, समयकृत मूल्यांक दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथमा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० सं०/123/77(47)]

New Delhi, the 5th March, 1980

S.O. 680.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mangi Lal, Mandpia, Tehsil Bhadesar, District Chittorgarh (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 123-Kapasan constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mangi Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/123/77(47)]

का० आ० 681.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 132-चांगीठोरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कांदूयालाल, पूत्र धूलजी, भील, पलेम नोगामा, डा० नोगामा, तहसील चांगीठोरा, जिला बांसवाड़ा (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिए गए प्रमाणेवत पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री कांदूयालाल को संगद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथमा विधान परिषद् के मदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०-वि० सं०/132/77(53)]

S.O. 681.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kanhaiya Lal, S/o. Shri Dhulji, Bhil, Place Nagama, P. O. Nagama, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 132-Bagidora (ST) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kanhaiya Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/132/77(53)]

नई दिल्ली, 6 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 682.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 161-सोजत निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री शुभलाल, महालक्ष्मी मंदिर के सामने, सोजत सिटी, जिला पाली, (राजस्थान), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रूपनि में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी नेत्रा वाचिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

श्री० यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायोक्रिय नहीं है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसार में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यूआर उक्त श्री शुभलाल की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज० वि० म०/161/77(52)]
आदेश से,

ओ० ना० नागर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th March, 1980

S.O. 682.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Subh Lal Opposite Maha Lakshmi Mandir, Sojat City, District Pali, (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for general election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 161-Sojat constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Subh Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/161/77(52)]

By Order,
O. N. NAGAR, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 683.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 29-बाराबंकी (अ०ज० ००३०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री वैज नाथ, ग्राम करन्द, पोस्ट जांगीगांव राज०, बागबंकी लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित ग्रामने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी नेत्रा वाचिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

श्री० यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायोक्रिय नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसार में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यूआर उक्त श्री वैज नाथ को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०-न०० म०/29/77(5)]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1980

S.O. 683.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Baij Nath, Village Karand, Post Jehangirabad Raj, Barabanki, a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People held in 1977 from 29-Barabanki (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Baij Nath to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-HP/29/77(5)]

का० आ० 684.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 384-बुलन्दशहर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री डाम्बर सिंह, गराम घासी, बुलन्दशहर, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित ग्रामने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी नेत्रा वाचिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

श्री० यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्यायोक्रिय नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसार में निर्वाचन आयोग एनडब्ल्यूआर उक्त श्री डाम्बर सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० स०/384/77(80)]

S.O. 684.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Dambar Singh, Sarai Ghasi, Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 384-Bulandshahr constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Dambar Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/384/77(80)]

का० आ० 685.—यतः निर्बाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बाचित के लिए 384-बुलन्डशहर निर्बाचित थेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री धाना प्रसाद, अन्सारी रोड, युक्तवाहन, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रथिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्बाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्बाचित आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रथिनियम की धारा 10-के अनुसरण में निर्बाचित आयोग एन्डड्वारा उक्त श्री धाना प्रसाद को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के मद्दय चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारतीय की तारीख से सीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० स०/384/77(81)]

S.O. 685.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Dhan Prasad, Ansari Road, Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 384-Bulandshahr constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Dhan Prasad to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/384/77(81)]

प्र० ६८६.—यतः निर्बाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बाचित के लिए 420-रुड्की निर्बाचित थेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बनश्याम, प्राप्त नगला हमगती, तहसील रुड्की, जिला सहारनपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रथिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्बाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्बाचित आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त प्रथिनियम की धारा 10-के अनुसरण में निर्बाचित आयोग एन्डड्वारा उक्त श्री बनश्याम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के मद्दय चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारतीय की तारीख से सीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० स०/420/77(82)]

S.O. 686.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ghan Shiam, Village Nagla Imrati (Saharanpur), a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 420-Roorkee constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ghan Shiam to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/420/77(82)]

का० आ० 687.—यतः निर्बाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1977 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बाचित के लिए 420-रुड्की निर्बाचित थेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गम जनन लाल, शुभाश गंज, रुड्की, जिला सहारनपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रथिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्बाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ।

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्बाचित आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है ।

अतः अब, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने साधारण धारा 10-के अनुसरण में निर्बाचित आयोग एन्डड्वारा उक्त श्री गम जनन लाल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के मद्दय चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस भारतीय की तारीख से सीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० स०/420/77(83)]

S.O. 687.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Rattan Lal, Subhas Ganj, Roorkee a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in 1977 from 420-Roorkee constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Rattan Lal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/420/77(83)]

नई विल्सो, 19 करवरी, 1979

का० आ० 688.—यतः निर्बाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए विहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्बाचित के लिए 296 मझांगां (अ०.ज०.आ०.) निर्बाचित-थेव से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सोनारा सिरका, ग्राम चिमोसाई, डाकवर ऐडियाटांगर, जिला सिंहभूम (विहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रथिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्बाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ।

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकार स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्बाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है ।

अतः यह, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निवाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री गोनारा सिरका को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के गदरप चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की सारीश से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[मं० बिहार-विं०म० 296/77(148)]

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1980

S.O. 688.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sonara Sirkha, Village Chimisai, Post Kheriathanagar, District Singhbhum, Bihar a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 296-Majhgaon (ST constituency), has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sonara Sirkha to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/296/77(148)]

का०मा० 689.—यतः निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए विहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचित के लिए 296-मण्डल (म०ज०जा०) निवाचित-सत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सामुचरन हैम्बरम, ग्राम कुम्हरम, डाकघर तांतनगर जिला सिंहभूम (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

ओर यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः यह, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निवाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री सामुचरन हैम्बरम को संसद के किसी भी सदस्य के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की सारीश से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[मं० बिहार-विं०म० 296/77(149)]

S.O. 689.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sadhu Charan Hembram, Village Kunbram, P.O. Tantuagar, District Singhbhum, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June 1977 from 296-Majhgaon (ST) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sadhu Charan Hembram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/296/77(149)]

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 1980

का०मा० 690.—यतः निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचित के लिए 253-विश्वनूपुर सभा निवाचित-सत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जनार्दन मिश्रा श्यामरायेर बाजार डाकघर विश्वनूपुर जिला बांकुरा (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

ओर, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपर्णी हम असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः यह, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निवाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री जनार्दन मिश्रा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीश से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करती है।

[मं० प० बं०-विं०म० 253/77]

S.O. 690.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Janardan Misra, Shyamrayer Bazar, P.O. Bishnupur, Distt. Bankura, (West Bengal), a contesting candidate for general election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 253-Vishnupur assembly constituency, held in June 1977, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after due notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Janardhan Misra, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[WB-LA/253/77]

का०मा० 691.—यतः निवाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए विहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निवाचित के लिए 191-झेंडुपुरा निवाचित-सत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रिद्धेश्वर शर्मा, ग्राम ब प०० मेहम, जिला मुग्गेर, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम,, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचित व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

ओर यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निवाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है,

अतः यह, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निवाचित आयोग एतदद्वारा उक्त श्री रिद्धेश्वर शर्मा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीश से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[मं० बिहार वि० स०/191/77(150)]

S.O. 691.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Shidheshwar Sharma, Village & P.O. Mehus, District Monghyr, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 191-Sheikhpura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Shidheshwar Sharma to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/191/77(150)]

कांग्रा० ६९२।—यतः निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 191-शेषपुरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने थाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम बहादुर सिंह, आम व पौ० सत्तारी, घासा हलसी, जिला मुगेर बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा नवधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह सभी समझान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुभरण में निर्वाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम बहादुर सिंह को संसद सदस्य के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०स० 191/77(151)]

S.O. 692.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Bhadur Singh, Village Monia, P.O. Tarhari, P. S. Hajsi, District Monghyr, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 191-Sheikhpura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Bhadur Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/191/77(151)]

कांग्रा० ६९३।—यतः निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 191-शेषपुरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने थाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम नरेण गिह, आम व पौ० मेहम, घासा शेषपुरा, जिला मुगेर, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा नवधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह समझान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह समझान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुभरण में निर्वाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम नरेण गिह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०स० 191/77(152)]

S.O. 693.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Naresh Singh, Village & P.O. Mehus P. S. Sheikhpura, District Monghyr, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 191-Sheikhpura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Naresh Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/191/77(152)]

कांग्रा० ६९४।—यतः निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 191-शेषपुरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार काशी यादव, मुहल्ला इनदाय, पौ० शेषपुरा, जिला मुगेर, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा नवधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह समझान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, एतद्वारा अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुभरण में निर्वाचन प्रायोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री काशी यादव को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०स० 191/77(153)]

S.O. 694.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kashi Yadav, Mohalla Indoy, P.O. Sheikhpura, District Monghyr, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 191-Sheikhpura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kashi Yadav to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/191/77(153)]

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1980

का०आ० 693.—यतः निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि परिचमी बंगाल राज्य में हुए विधान सभा के लिए माधारण निर्वाचित के लिए 93-स्वरूपनगर निर्वाचित-भेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नकुल चन्द्र साना, डाकघर एवं ग्राम निरमन, जिला 24 परगना, परिचमी बंगाल लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचित व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा वालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

प्रतः प्रथ, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त आयोग कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

का०आ० 694.—यतः निर्वाचित आयोग की धारा 10- के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नकुल चन्द्र साना को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने प्रीत होने के लिए इस प्रावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० प० वि० सं०/93/77(1)]

New Delhi, the 21st February, 1980

S.O. 695.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nakul Chandra Sana, P.O. & Vill. Nirman, Distt. 24-Parganas, West Bengal, a contesting candidate for general election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 93-Swarupnagar assembly constituency, held in June, 1977, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nakul Chandra Sana to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/93/77(1)]

का०आ० 696.—यतः निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए परिचमी बंगाल राज्य के लिए माधारण निर्वाचित के लिए 93-स्वरूपनगर सभा निर्वाचित-भेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नलिनी रंजन बैनर्जी, ग्राम राधाकटी, डाकघर तनरापुर, जिला 24 परगना, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचित व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा वालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

1267 GI/79—3

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे गम्भीर सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

प्रतः प्रथ, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 10के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नलिनी रंजन बैनर्जी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने प्रीत होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० प० वि० सं०/93/77(2)]

S.O. 696.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nalini Ranjan Banerjee, Vill. Raghabkati, P.O. Sanrapul Distt. 24-Parganas, a contesting candidate for general election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 93-Swarupnagar assembly constituency, held in June, 1977, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nalini Ranjan Banerjee, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/93/77(2)]

का०आ० 697.—यतः निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचित के लिए 110-राघोपुर निर्वाचित-भेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रामसागर पोदार, ग्राम व पो० बसंतपुर, जिला सहरसा, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचित व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा वालिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

प्रतः प्रथ, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम सागर पोदार को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने प्रीत होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/110/77(154)]

S.O. 697.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Sagar Podar, Village & P.O. Basantpur, District Saharsa, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 110-Raghupur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Sagar Podar to be disqualified, for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/110/77(154)]

नई विल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 698.—यतः निर्बाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1977 में हुए लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 36-आरा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री विनोद धारी सिंह, ग्राम उलर, पो० जिला पटना (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

यतः आव, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री विनोद धारी सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[स० बिहार लो० स०/36/77(15)]

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1980

S.O. 698.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Vinod Dhari Singh, Village, Ular, Post Office Lala, Bhadsara (Bharatpura), Distt. Patna (Bihar), a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People held in March, 1977 from 36-Arrah constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Vinod Dhari Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-HP/36/77(15)]

का० आ० 699.—यतः, निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1977 में बिहार में हुए लोक सभा/विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 36-आरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री शिवनारायण दास, ग्राम प्रहियापुर भनेर, पो० मनेर जिला पटना (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

यतः आव, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री शिवनारायण दास को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[स० बिहार लो० स०/36/77(16)]

S.O. 699.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sheo Narayan Das, Village Ahiyapur Maner, P.O. Maner, District Patna, Bihar, a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People held in March, 1977 from 36-Arrah constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sheo Narayan Dass, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-HP/36/77(16)]

का० आ० 700.—यतः, निर्वाचित आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार में मार्च, 1977 में हुए लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 42-नवादा (आ० जा०) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कैलाश राम, ग्राम पंच, गाना हिसुमा, जिला नवादा (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पूर्ण सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचित आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

यतः आव, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचित आयोग एवं द्वारा उक्त श्री कैलाश राम को संसद के किसी भी मदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[स० बिहार लो० स०/42/77(17)]

S.O. 700.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kailash Ram, Village Panchu, P.S. Hissua, District, Nawadah (Bihar) a contesting candidate for general election to the House of the People held in March, 1977 from 42-Nawadah (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kailash Ram, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-HP/42/77(17)]

का० आ० 701।—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल की विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 98-सन्देशखाली (प्र० जा०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सुनील कामर नायक, गोव ब्रेमारी, पो० इच्छापुराबाद, जिला 24-परगना, पश्चिमी बंगाल, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए, गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन अवृत्तों का लेखा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सुनील कुमार नायक को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है।

[स० प० द०-वि० स०/98/77]

S.O. 701।—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sunil Kumar Nayek, Village Bedemari, P.O. Ichhapurabad, Distt. 24-Parganas, West Bengal, a contesting candidate for general election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 98-Sandeshkhali (SC) assembly constituency, held in June, 1977, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sunil Kumar Nayek to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/98/77]

का० आ० 702।—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 293-इचागढ़ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जानकी नाथ माझी, ग्राम काशीदीह, पो० ओका, घाना घांडिल, जिला सिंहभूम, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन अवृत्तों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जानकी नाथ माझी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है।

[स० बिहार-वि० स०/293/77(156)]

S.O. 702।—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Janki Nath Majhi, Village Kashidih, P. O. Chauka, P. S. Chandil, District Singhbhum, Bihar a contesting can-

didate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 293-Ichagarh constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Janki Nath Majhi to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/293/77(156)]

का० आ० 703।—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1977 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 293-इचागढ़ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री चन्द्रशेखर झा, ग्राम सुभाकरपुर तिकोली, पो० तीसीमाईता, जिला वैशाली, बिहार लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन अवृत्तों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री चन्द्रशेखर झा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहृत घोषित करता है।

[स० बिहार-वि० स०/293/77(157)]

S.O. 703।—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chandra Shekhar Jha, Village Subhakarpur, Tikauli, P. O. Tisauta, District Vaishali, Bihar a contesting candidate for general election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in June, 1977 from 293-Ichagarh constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chandra Shekhar Jha to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/293/77(157)]

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1980

S.O. 704।—In pursuance of Section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the judgment dated the 11th December, 1979 of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench in Election Petition No. 2 of 1978.

**IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD, LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW**

Election Petition No. 2 of 1978

Km. Sharada DeviPetitioner.

Versus

Sri Krishna Chandra Pant and othersOpp. Parties.

Petition Under Section 81 of the Representation of People Act, 1951.

Counsel for Petitioner.—Shri Laloo Singh.

Counsel for Opp. Parties.—Sri Bishun Singh, Sri R. P. Singh and Sri Vishal Singh.

Lucknow Dated :—11-12-1979.

Hon'ble T. S. Misra, J.

By a notification published in Accordance with Section 12 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (hereinafter called 'the Act') the elected members of the U.P. Legislative Assembly were called upon to elect eleven members to the Council of State. The petitioner Km. Sharada Devi and the opposite parties contested that election. The poll was also held on 28-3-1978 and the counting of votes was also done on the same day under the supervision of the Secretary of the U.P. Legislative Assembly who was Returning Officer. After the counting of votes the opposite parties 1 to 11 were declared elected. The petitioner was, however, not elected. She has challenged the election of the opposite party No. 1 in this Writ Petition on the following grounds namely :

1. The result of the election has been materially affected by improper rejection of valid votes and improper acceptance of invalid votes;

2. On a correct and proper counting of votes the petitioner will be found to have received larger value of votes than the opposite party No. 1.

3. The result of the election has been materially affected due to non-compliance of the provisions of Representation of Peoples Act, 1951 and the conduct of Election Rules, 1961.

The facts set out by the petitioner in support of these grounds are these: The total number of votes polled* at the election was 421. The Returning Officer, however, rejected 11 ballot papers and treated the remaining 410 ballot papers as containing valid votes. The Returning Officer calculated the requisite quota to be of the value of 3417 and since the opposite parties 2 to 11 had received more than the value of quota the real contest remained between the petitioner and the opposite party No. 1 for the remaining eleventh seat. At the time of counting of votes several candidates, their election agents and counting agents were present. The Returning Officer was not first of all prepared to show to the aforesaid persons the ballot papers which he was going to reject. He only told them that the ballot papers had such marks or cuttings by which the voter could be identified. When the candidates and their agents insisted for inspection of such ballot papers being shown to them before being rejected, the Returning Officer very reluctantly showed only four of these ballot papers. He had not allowed the other ballot papers to be inspected by the candidates but told that they were also liable to be rejected on the ground that they bore similar marks. The opposite party No. 1 had received only 25 first preference votes having value of 25.00. He could not be declared elected in the first round of counting as he had not obtained the requisite quota of 3417 value. The petitioner had obtained two first preference votes but as the subsequent trend of counting showed she continued to get larger number of surplus value of votes. The petitioner has further alleged in her petition that out of her ballot papers illegally rejected by the Returning Officer, one ballot paper contained a first preference vote in her favour. This ballot paper was wrongly rejected by the Returning Officer on the ground that it contained over writing in respect of 10th preference vote marked therein. Similarly another ballot paper was rejected by the Returning Officer on the ground that the figure '4' indicating fourth preference therein was marked within bracket. This ballot paper had recorded first preference in favour of opposite party No. 4 Sri Kalraj. The returning officer treated the said bracket as a mark by which the voter could be identified and hence he rejected it. This

rejection, according to the petitioner, was illegal and in contravention of Rule 73(2)(d) of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961. At any rate the ballot paper was valid upto 3rd preference. Further one ballot paper containing first preference vote for opposite party Sri Surendra Mohan was illegally rejected by the returning officer on the ground that the voter had given first preference vote at two places whereas in fact the voter had given first preference vote only to Sri Surendra Mohan and had given 11th preference vote to another candidate by making the numerical 11, but there was overwriting in one of the numericals which formed the figure 11. The Returning Officer wrongly said that the overwriting in the numerical '1' comprised in the numerical 11 was to be ignored and thus erred in holding this 11th preference vote as a first preference vote for a second candidate also. Further the Returning Officer also invalidated two other ballot papers on the ground that there were overwriting in respect of 8th and 9th preference votes respectively. These ballot papers did not contain any mark or writing by which the voter could be identified. It is alleged that the action of the Returning Officer in not showing the remaining seven ballot papers to the candidates or the counting agents or election agents before rejecting the same was illegal and arbitrary. Objections against rejection of aforesaid ballot papers were filed in writing before the Returning Officer but to no effect. At any rate the Returning Officer should have in the alternative at least accepted those ballot papers to be valid in respect of preferences prior to the preference which contained the alleged mark or cutting. Further it is averred in paragraph 20 of the petition that in one of the ballot papers which recorded a first preference vote in favour of opposite party Sri Kamla Pati the fifth preference was marked twice and there was an overwriting too therein but the Returning Officer treated the same as valid ballot paper in favour of respondent Sri Kamlapati though all the aforesaid eleven ballot papers under similar circumstances were rejected. This ballot paper had also recorded a preference in favour of the opposite party No. 1 and at the time of distribution of surplus votes of opposite party Sri Kamlapati the value of this ballot paper was added to the credit of opposite party No. 1 Sri Krishna Chandra Pant. If this ballot paper was excluded from the count, the value of the votes received by opposite party No. 1 would have been reduced. Hence it is contained that but for the improper rejection of valid votes and improper acceptance of invalid votes the petitioner would have succeeded at the election.

Notices were issued to the opposite parties. The petition has been opposed by the respondent No. 1 who has filed his written statement. The other opposite parties did not put in appearance and did not file their written statements. The case has proceeded ex parte against them.

The opposite party No. 1 in his written statement has alleged that the petitioner has incorrectly quoted Rule 27A of Part VI of the Conduct of Election Rules as applicable to this case, in fact the correct Rules, according to opposite party No. 1, about the method of voting is Rule 37A. At the time of counting and declaration of result the Deputy Election Commissioner, Delhi and Joint Chief Electoral Officer, U.P. were also present. The opposite party No. 1 has denied that there was any improper acceptance of any invalid votes or improper rejection of any valid votes or the result of the election has been materially affected at all. According to him the petition is defective inasmuch as it does not contain a concise statement of material facts. The quota calculated was to be of the value of 3217. The opposite parties 2 to 11 received more than the quota, hence they were declared elected. The Returning Officer thereafter proceeded under Rule 79 of the Conduct of Election Rules and found that the opposite party No. 1 got twenty five first preference votes—the value thereof being 2500. The petitioner received only two first preference votes and their value was 200. The Returning Officer then proceeded to transfer the surplus votes of the candidates who received the highest number of votes in the first count. In the second round none got the requisite quota and so also upto the thirteenth round. In the fourteenth count the answering opposite party was declared elected as the value of his ballot papers (votes) exceeded the value of his ballot papers (votes) of all other continuing candidates together with the surplus votes not transferred. The value of the ballot papers (votes) of the answering opposite party came to 3322 and the value

of the ballot papers (votes of the petitioner to 3073. Opposite party No. 1 has denied that the Returning Officer was not first of all prepared to show the persons present in the counting hall the ballot papers which he was going to reject. Actually he showed the ballot papers and also explained the reasons for rejection. On a request for inspection at a closer range, the Returning Officer through one of his Assistant on counting duty arranged a closer inspection and the Assistant moved from table to table and showed the rejected papers to whoever so requested. It is also not true that the Returning Officer did not allow the rejected ballot papers to be inspected. The ballot papers were rightly rejected under Rule 73(2) of the Conduct of Election Rules. In reply to paragraph 14 of the petition, it has been averred that in the rejected ballot papers, there were no ballot papers in which the petitioner received a first preference vote. In reply to paragraph 15 it is stated that the Returning Officer had declared that he was rejecting a certain ballot paper because figure '4' was put in with an unusual and absolutely unnecessary mark. The petitioner was not present in the hall and none objected on her behalf. The opposite party No. 1 in reply to paragraph 17 of the petition has alleged that it was incorrect that the Returning Officer has mis-read figure '11' as '1'. The petitioner should have given particulars of the ballot paper under reference. The calculation of votes in the manner in which the petitioner has assessed is wrong in reply to paragraph 18 of the petition, it is alleged that the Returning Officer while acting under Rule 73(2) rightly and lawfully rejected the ballot papers which were not marked according to rules. The petitioners admits overwriting on ballot papers, such overwriting was not permitted under the Rules. So far as paragraph 20 of the petition, it is alleged by the opposite party No. 1 that the averments of the said paragraph of the petition have been connected for the purposes of the election petition. In fact no objection was raised in this regard at the time of counting. The opposite party No. 1 has also raised certain technical objections in his written statement. According to him the petition is vague and lacks in material facts and particulars and the copy of the petition served on him bears only one signature at page 14. According to opposite party No. 1 the copy of the petition should have borne the full signature of the petitioner on each and every page. The verification of the petition is also not in accordance with the law. The petition does not disclose any cause of action. It was a multiple election whereas the election of the opposite party No. 1 has been challenged, hence the votes cannot be scrutinised.

Sri Laloo Singh, Advocate, who appeared on behalf of the petitioner made statement on October, 1978 that the result of the election had been materially affected due to non-compliance or provisions of sub-Rule (2)(d) of Rule 73 of the conduct of Election Rules and Rule 76 of the said Rules.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed :—

1. Whether the result of the election has been materially affected by the improper rejection of valid votes and improper acceptance of invalid votes ?

2. Whether the result of the election has been materially affected due to non-compliance of the provisions of sub-rule (2)(d) of Rule 73 and Rule 76 of the Conduct of Election Rules ?

3. Whether the petition does not give a concise statement of material facts as required by Section 83 of the Representation of the People Act ? If so, its effect ?

4. (a) Whether the Returning Officer did not show the ballot papers to the candidates or their election agents and counting agents before rejecting the same ?

(b) Whether the Returning Officer did not explain the reasons for rejection of the ballot papers ?

5. Whether the allegations made in paragraph 12, 14, 17, and 19 of the petition are vague and liable to be struck out ?

6. Whether any objection against the rejection of the ballot papers was filed in writing by or on behalf of the petitioner before the Returning Officer ?

7. Whether a true copy of the election petition duly signed by the petitioner has not been served on the opposite party No. 1 ? If so its effect ?

8. Whether the verification of election petition is in accordance with Law ?

9. Whether the election of the opposite party No. 1 cannot be challenged without challenging the election of other candidates who had sought election and were declared successful in the same election and whether the votes cannot be scrutinised on that ground ?

10. Whether the election of the opposite party No. 1 is liable to be set aside ?

11. What relief is the petition entitled to ?

Issue Nos. 3 and 5 :

These two issues were treated as preliminary issues. The findings on these issues were accordingly recorded by me on 9th January, 1979. The said issues were found in the negative. Findings on those issues shall form part of this judgment.

I now proceed to record my findings on the remaining issues :—

Issues Nos. 1 and 2 :

The petitioner has alleged that the result of the election had been materially affected by improper rejection of valid votes and improper acceptance of invalid votes. Section 100 of the Representation of the people Act, 1951 (hereinafter called 'the Act') provides that subject to the provisions of sub-section (2) thereof, if the High Court is of opinion that the result of election in so far as it concerns a returned candidate has been materially affected by the improper reception, refusal or rejection of any vote or the reception of any vote which is void or by any non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of the Act or of any Rules or Orders made under the Act, the High Court shall declare the election of the Returned candidate to be void. The ground on which the election of opposite party No. 1 has been impugned by the election petitioner is therefore, to be considered in the light of the provisions of Section 100(1)(d) (iii) of the Act. The scope of inquiry under section 100(1) (d)(iii) of the Act is to determine whether the result of the election in so far as it concerned to a returned candidate has been materially affected by an improper reception or improper rejection of any vote. On this inquiry the onus is on the petitioner to show that by reason of the infirmities specified in Section 100(1)(d)(iii) the result of the returned candidate has been materially affected. It is equally well settled that the burden is upon the election petitioner to show affirmatively that the result of the election has been materially affected due to non-compliance with the provisions of the Act or Rules framed thereunder. The Court has to see whether the burden has been successfully discharged by the election petitioner by demonstrating to the Court either positively or even reasonably that the poll would have gone against the returned candidate if the breach of the rules had not occurred (see 1969 Supreme Court, 663) Paokari Hackip Vs. Rishang and others. Construing the words 'the result of the election has been materially affected', the Supreme Court in A.I.R. 1954, 513 (Vashist Narain Sharma Vs. Deo Chandra and others) has observed that the result should not be judged by the mere increase or decrease in the total number of votes secured by the returned candidate but by the proof of the fact that the wasted votes would have been distributed in such a manner between the contesting candidates as would have brought about the defeat of the returned candidate. It cannot be held that the mere fact that wasted votes are greater than the margin of votes between the returned candidate and the candidate securing the next highest number of votes must lead to the necessary inference that the result of the election has been materially affected. That is a matter which has to be proved and the onus of proving it lies on the petitioner. Should the petitioner fail to adduce satisfactory evidence to enable the court to find in his favour on this point the inevitable result would be that the court would not infer in his favour and would allow the election to stand. It has, therefore, to be seen (i) whether there was improper rejection of any valid votes, (ii) whether there was improper acceptance of any invalid votes, and (iii) whether the result of the election had been materially affected by the same.

So far as the improper acceptance of any invalid votes is concerned, the averments made on behalf of the petitioner is to be found in para 20 of the petition which runs as follows :—

"That in one of the ballot papers which recorded a first preference vote in favour of respondent Sri Kamlapati, the fifth preference was marked twice and there was a over-writing too therein, but the Returning Officer treated the same as a valid ballot paper in favour of respondent Sri Kamlapati though all the aforesaid eleven ballot papers under similar circumstances were rejected. This ballot paper had also recorded a preference in favour of the respondent No. 1 and at the time of distribution of surplus votes of respondent Sri Kamlapati the value of this ballot paper was added to the credit of respondent No. 1, Sri Krishna Chandra Pant. If this ballot paper was excluded from the count the value of the votes received by the respondent No. 1 would have been reduced."

There is no other averment in the petition with regard to improper acceptance of invalid votes by the Returning Officer. The said averment in paragraph 20 of the petition was denied by the opposite party No. 1 in paragraph 20 of his written statement which reads as under :—

"That the contents of this paragraph are entirely false. It has been concocted for the purposes of this Election Petition. In fact, no objection was raised in this regard at the time of counting. It is speculative and in the nature of a fishing and reving enquiry."

The burden, therefore, lay on the petitioner to prove that the Returning Officer had improperly accepted invalid votes as valid votes. In my view she has failed to discharge that burden. The petitioner has not given any detail of the alleged ballot paper said to have been improperly accepted. That apart, no witness examined on behalf of the petitioner has deposcd to the facts stated in paragraph 20 of the petition. Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui was the counting agent of the Petitioner and Sri Kalap Nath Singh was the Election Agent of the petitioner. Both of them were present in the hall at the time of the counting of votes. The petitioner has examined both of them namely, Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui as P.W. 1 and Sri Kalap Nath Singh as P.W. 3, but neither of them has stated anything in support of the averments made in paragraph 20 of the petition. Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui had also filed an objection before the Returning Officer when the counting of votes was going on. That Objection is Ex. 1. But that too is significantly silent with regard to the facts stated in paragraph 20 of the petition. The petitioner has not examined herself in the case. Sri Udit Narain Sharma (P.W. 2) who was also present at time of counting of votes has also not stated any thing in his deposition about the averments made in paragraph 20 of the petition. On the other hand Habibul Rahman Nomani (R.W. 1) has stated in his deposition that no candidate or counting agent raised any objection to the effect that any vote had been wrongly accepted as valid vote. Sri Deo Bahadur Singh (R.W. 2) has also made a similar statement in her deposition. It has thus not been proved that the Returning Officer had improperly accepted any invalid vote as valid vote. Sri S. P. Singh the Returning Officer (R.W. 3) stated that all objections raised before him pertained to only 11 ballot papers which were rejected. In other words, no objection was raised with regard to those ballot papers which were accepted. Hence in view of sub-clause (6) of Rule 56 of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961 if had to be assumed that every ballot paper which was not rejected constituted a valid vote. There is, therefore, no substance in the contention that any vote was improperly received as alleged.

Now remains the question as to whether there had been an improper rejection of any valid votes by the Returning Officer. It is a common case that the Returning Officer had rejected 11 ballot papers under Sub-Rule (2) of Rule 73 of the Conduct of Election Rules. The case of the petitioner is that the Returning Officer showed only four rejected ballot papers to the candidates who were present in the hall and to the counting agents and Election Agents of the Candidates

and did not show the remaining seven ballot papers. She has thus not given any particulars of the seven ballot papers, which according to her were also improperly and wrongly rejected. But she has tried to give particulars of the remaining four ballot papers in paragraphs 14, 15, 17 and 18. Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui was appointed by the petitioner as her Counting Agent. He has present in the half where he counting of votes took place. He filed a written objection on behalf of the petitioner. Ex. 1 is a certified copy of that objection. In that objection Shakir Ali Siddiqui pointed out that the Returning Officer had rejected 11 ballot papers mostly on the ground that some cuttings had been made which may be identity marks, that the process of preferential voting indicates that the voter should give his preferences in figures and that most of the ballot papers were clearly having numerical marks upto No. 10 and thereafter there is over-writing or some cuttings. It was thus admitted on behalf of the petitioner even in the objection Ex. 1 that in most of the ballot papers which had been rejected then was "writing or some cutting". In his deposition also Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui admitted that he had sufficient opportunity to see 4 or 5 disputed ballot papers; that one of the ballot papers which was rejected and shown to him contains the mark of No. 1 against the name of Km. Sraddha Devi; that in the said rejected ballot papers which were shown to him he had noticed that the marking against K. Sraddha Devi was correct and not disfigured but the marking of preference against the name of some other candidate in the same ballot paper was disfigured; that he did not ask the returning officer at any stage of the process of counting of votes to recount the votes. In his cross-examination Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqui admitted that he had no other objection with regard to the counting of votes and the validity of the ballot papers and the votes except those which he had taken in his objection Ex. 1. He also admitted that he did not state in his objection Ex. 1 that one of the rejected ballot papers had the mark of first preference against his candidate Km. Sraddha Devi and that the same had also been illegally rejected. He did not recollect as to whether he had ever informed Km. Sraddha Devi that out of 11 ballot papers, there was one ballot paper which had the mark of first preference against the name of K. Sraddha Devi and that the said mark was not disfigured.

Sri Kalap Nath Singh (P.W. 3) stated that the Returning Officer had shown 4 or 5 ballot papers to the counting agent and he did not show the remaining ballot papers which were rejected, that the Returning Officer was of the view that due to cuttings made in the marks put on the rejected ballot papers the identity of the voter could be ascertained, that in one or two rejected ballot papers Sri Kalap Nath Singh had noticed that mark of third or fourth preference had been put against the name of Km. Sraddha Devi. He told Km. Sraddha Devi that he had seen the mark of tenth preference in one or two rejected ballot papers. The statement of Sri Kalap Nath Singh does not improve the statement of Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqui (P.W. 1).

Sri Udit Narain Sharma (P.W. 2) was also present in the counting hall at the time of the counting of votes on 28th March, 1979. He was there as Election Agent of Sri Surendra Mohan, who had also sought election. He had filed one objection before the Returning Officer on behalf of Sri Surendra Mohan. Ex. 3 is a copy of that objection. In that objection Sri Udit Narain Sharma clearly stated that in one of the two ballot papers which he had seen the figure '1' had been written twice, hence it was invalid but in the other ballot paper the figure '1' was written at only one place whereas at the other place in the said ballot paper the figure '11' was written in Hindi and that it was neither cut nor over written, hence that ballot paper was valid and at any rate it could be counted upto 10th preference. Significantly Sri Udit Narain Sharma did not raise any objection with regard to any other ballot paper which had been rejected, and even with regard to the two ballot papers which he had referred to in his objection he was quite clear that one of them was invalid but with regard to the other he was of the view that either it was valid or it could be read upto 10th preference because the 11th preference according to him was written in Hindi. The evidence of Sri Udit Narain Sharma, is, therefore, of no probative value.

Sri Lakshmi Sahai Saxena who was present in the Hall at the time of the counting of votes as Counting Agent of

Surendra Singh had also filed an objection, a copy of which is Ex. 2. He stated in his objection that while preliminary counting of ballot papers was going on it was discussed that in nine ballot papers there were some cuttings, in some at preference No. 8, in some at preference No. 9, and in some at preference No. 10. In another ballot paper figure '4' was written in bracket. In yet another ballot paper the voter had recorded his 11th preference also but the Returning Officer had rejected the same on the ground that it recorded two first preference of votes. All the said ballot papers, according to Sri Lakshmi Sahai Saxena, were valid and the ground that the voters could be identified by the cutting is wholly untenable. He, therefore, requested the Returning Officer that he should treat the said ballot papers as valid ballot papers and in any case, partly valid preference. The Returning Officer had rejected all the objections contained in Exs. 1, 2, and 3. One thing is obvious from the objection of Lakshmi Sahai Saxena that he had the opportunity of seeing all the 11 rejected ballot papers and he had found that in nine ballot papers there were some cuttings and that in the 10th ballot paper figure '4' was written in bracket. With regard to the 11th ballot paper, the Returning Officer was of the view that it had recorded two first preferences.

As against the above evidence the opposite party No. 1 has examined four witnesses. Sri Habibul Rahman Nomani (R.W. 1) Sri Deo Bahadur Singh (R.W. 2) Sri P. K. Misra (R.W. 3) and Sri Satya Priya Singh (P.W. 4). Sri Habibul Rahman Nomani was appointed by Smt. Manohra one of the candidates as her counting Agent. He was present in the hall at the time of the counting of votes. According to him all the 11 rejected ballot papers were shown to all the candidates, their Counting Agents and Election Agents who were present in the counting hall. He had also seen those 11 rejected ballot papers. He, however, did not recollect at the time of deposition whether any of the 11 rejected ballot papers of first preference vote was given to Km. Sraddha Devi, but he did depose that out of the 11 rejected ballot papers, there was one ballot paper in which first preference mark was noted against the name of Smt. Manohra, and another first preference mark was noted against the name of one more candidate and that is why it was declared invalid. He did not know what preference mark was noted against the name of Km. Sraddha Devi in the said ballot paper.

Sri Deo Bahadur Singh (R.W. 2) admitted that objections were raised with regard to the validity of the 11 ballot papers which had been rejected. He stated that Sri Kesari Nath Tripathi, who was present at the time of the counting of votes had also cited a ruling in support of his arguments regarding the validity of the said ballot papers. The Returning Officer held all the objections. He also sent for a book from his Library and went through it and after considering all the arguments and the objections raised orally, he passed his order rejecting the said eleven ballot papers. He endorsed his order on the said ballot papers giving reasons there for. There after according to Sri Deo Bahadur Singh every person present in the counting hall was satisfied and the counting started 'till the result was finally declared. According to this witness the Returning Officer showed the ballot paper on the asking of Sri Kesari Nath Tripathi and pointed out that the markings thereon were of such a nature that the identity of the voter could be ascertained.

Sri Satya Priya Singh (R.W. 4) who was the Returning Officer was also examined in the case as a witness on behalf of opposite party No. 1. He deposed that eleven ballot papers were found to be defective. They were shown to the candidates, Counting Agents, and Election Agents who were sitting in front of him in the room. After seeing the ballot papers certain persons raised a few objections, the arguments for and against were heard and after hearing the arguments he rejected the said eleven ballot papers. According to the witness he made endorsements of his decision on each of the aforesaid eleven ballot papers. He was emphatic that it was incorrect that he had shown only 4 or 5 defective ballot papers to the persons concerned. He had rejected 11 ballot papers under Rule 73 of the Conduct of Election Rules. According to this witness the main objection was that the marks on ballot papers were not identification marks and the objection pertained to only eleven ballot papers which were disputed and did not relate to any other ballot paper.

An analysis of the evidence both documentary and oral thus makes it quite manifest that the eleven ballot papers were rejected under Rule 73 of the Election Rules. The petitioner's contention is that only four ballot papers were shown and she has tried to give particulars of those ballot papers. Obviously she did not give any particulars of the remaining seven ballot papers. She applied for inspection of all the eleven ballot papers. However, vice my order dated 2nd May, 1979, inspection of four rejected ballot papers referred to in the election petition was allowed. The Returning Officer was directed to send the sealed packet of the rejected ballot papers to the Joint Registrar of this Court and the Joint Registrar was directed that he shall open the aforesaid sealed packet of the rejected ballot papers, allow the petitioner and opposite party No. 1 or their counsel to see the face of the ballot papers and inspect the four rejected ballot papers referred to in the election petition, but the Joint Registrar was not to permit the rejected ballot papers to go out of his hand. He was directed not to permit the petitioner or opposite party No. 1 or their counsel to handle the ballot papers. The Joint Registrar was to open the packet containing the rejected ballot papers in presence of the petitioner or her counsel and opposite party No. 1 or his counsel. From the report of the Joint Registrar dated 12-10-70 it appears that there was no ballot in the packet of rejected ballot papers answering the specification mentioned in para 14 of the Election Petition. Similarly no rejected ballot paper as specified in para 15 of the Election Petition was found out in that packet. Thus no ballot paper answering the specification given in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the election petition was found to exist in the sealed envelope. There was, however, a ballot paper answering the specification given in para 17 of the Election Petition. There was also another ballot paper answering the specification mentioned in para 18 of the Election Petition. Both the aforesaid ballot papers were, therefore, allowed to be inspected. These two ballot papers were kept by the Joint Registrar in one sealed cover and the remaining nine rejected ballot papers are kept by him in another sealed cover in the presence of the counsel for the parties. Subsequently the petitioner filed an application No. 24 (E) dated 28-11-1979 alleging that though the Court had allowed the inspection of ballot papers, the Joint Registrar gave only two ballot papers for inspection. It was, therefore urged by Shri Laloo Singh, Advocate, the learned Counsel for the petitioner that the Court may itself re-open the packets containing the rejected ballot papers and verify the correctness of the report of the Joint Registrar. The learned counsel for the opposite party No. 1 raised no objection to it. Consequently, the packets, containing the rejected ballot papers were got opened by me in the presence of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the opposite party No. 1. One packet contained two rejected ballot papers the inspection of which had been made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the opposite party No. 1 in the presence of the Joint Registrar. The other packet contained the remaining nine rejected ballot papers. It was found that the packet containing the nine rejected ballot papers did not have any such ballot papers which would answer the specifications and particulars given in paras 14 and 15 of the election petition and the report of the Joint Registrar in that behalf is correct. It also turned out that in one ballot paper, the inspection of which was made by the learned counsel for the parties, the first preference was noted against the name of Sri Surendra Mohan and the figure '1' in Hindi was also set against the name of Shri J. P. Singh. There was also some mutilated figure written towards the left of the Hindi figure '2' set against the name of Shri J. P. Singh. The learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the said left digit was also the figure '1' consisting of the figure '11'. I do not agree. The figure on the left was found to be over written in such a manner that it cannot be said with any definiteness that it constituted figure eleven. It could be said that the said left figure was scored out and the Voter marked the figure '2' in Hindi against the name of Shri J. P. Singh as well. In these circumstances the said ballot paper was rightly rejected by the Returning Officer under Rule 73(2)(b) of the Rules. The other rejected ballot paper, the inspection of which was made by the learned counsel for the parties, was also rightly rejected under rule 73(2)(b) of the Act inasmuch as there was over writing on figure '8' in such a manner that the elector could be identified. The petitioner has thus failed to make out that the Returning Officer had improperly rejected any valid ballot paper. The petitioner has also failed to make out that the result of the election has been materially

affected by the rejection of a valid vote as invalid and by the improper acceptance of an invalid vote as a valid vote. The learned counsel for the petitioner conceded even if the two rejected ballot papers of which inspection was made by him were treated as valid votes, the result of the election so far as the returned candidate opposite party No. 1 was concerned, will not be materially affected and that the petitioner would require still some more votes to win. The petitioner could not show as to how Rule 76 was not complied with by the Returning Officer.

For the reasons in the foregoing it is held that there was no improper rejection of any valid vote nor was there improper acceptance of any invalid vote. It is also held that the order of the Returning Officer in rejecting the ballot papers as invalid was in accordance with sub-rule (2) of Rule 73. Both the issues are, therefore, decided in the negative against the petitioner.

Issue No. 6 :

This issue has to be decided in positive. Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqui was the Counting Agent of the petitioner in the said election held on 28th March, 1978. He was present in the hall at the time of counting of votes. He did file an objection in writing on behalf of the petitioner before the Returning Officer against the rejection of the ballot papers in question. A certified copy of that objection is Ex. 1 on the record. I, therefore, hold that an objection against the rejection of ballot papers was filed in writing or behalf of the petitioner before the Returning Officer.

Issue No. 4(a) :

The principal contention of the petitioner in this election petition was that the Returning Officer did not show all the eleven disputed rejected ballot papers, to the candidates or their Election Agents or counting Agents before rejecting the same but had shown only 4 or 5 disputed ballot papers to them. This fact has been denied by the opposite party No. 1 in his written statement. The case of the opposite party No. 1 is that all eleven disputed ballot papers were shown to the candidates or their election agents and counting agents who were present in the counting hall at the time of the counting of votes. Both the parties have adduced oral and documentary evidence in support of their contentions. As pointed out earlier Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi, the counting Agent of the petitioner and Shri Kalap Nath Singh her Election Agent were present in the hall at the time of counting of votes. Both of them were examined by the petitioner as her witnesses. Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi in his examination in Chief stated that he had requested the Returning Officer to show him all the eleven ballot papers which he had rejected but so far as could remember on the date of his deposition, the Returning Officer showed him only 4 to 5 rejected ballot papers and with regard to the remaining ballot papers the Returning Officer told him that they contained similar defects as were found on the said 4 or 5 rejected ballot papers and did not show him those remaining ballot papers. He, however, admitted that he had sufficient opportunity to see and inspect the aforesaid 4 or 5 rejected ballot papers which were shown to him. In his cross-examination he however, admitted that he did not ask the Returning Officer in writing that the remaining rejected ballot papers should be shown to him and he also did not state that fact in his objection Ex. 1 which he had filed before the Returning Officer with regard to the rejected ballot papers though he said that he had made verbal request to the Returning Officer to show him all the rejected ballot papers. The objection filed by Sri Shakir Ali Siddiqi is Ex. 1 on the record. There is no averment in that objection that despite request the Returning Officer had not shown him all the rejected ballot papers and had shown him only 4 or 5 rejected ballot papers. There is no plausible reason as to why Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi did not state in writing in the objection Ex. 1 that only a few rejected ballot papers had been shown to him and the remaining rejected ballot papers had not been shown to him. Shri Kalap Nath Singh (P.W. 3) goes a step further in his deposition. He stated that after sorting out the ballot papers the Returning Officer said that eleven ballot papers had been rejected. He then made oral objection and requested that before rejecting the ballot papers. The objection filed by Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi

their agents. Some objections, according to him, were raised by the other persons in the hall. He further stated that Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi who was the counting agent of Km. Sraddha Devi also made objection to that effect orally as well as in writing. But the Returning Officer showed 4 or 5 ballot papers to the counting agents and he did not show the remaining ballot papers which were rejected. No document has been produced to show that Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi had requested the Returning Officer in writing that all the 11 ballot papers should be shown to him. The only document is Ex. 1 on the record but that document is silent on the point. The statement of Kalap Nath Singh that Shri Shakir Ali Siddiqi had made an objection to the Returning Officer in writing requesting him to show all the eleven rejected ballot papers cannot, therefore, be accepted. Shri Kalap Nath Singh deposed that he had other persons present in the counting hall had insisted that the Returning Officer should show all the ballot papers to the candidates or their agents. If the Returning Officer was not acceding to his request he could have filed an objection in writing in that behalf but he did not do so. His explanation for not filing an objection in writing was that since the Counting Agent of Km. Sraddha Devi had started writing himself, he did not see any occasion to draft in writing and file the same. The counting agent himself was competent to do so and he actually did file the objection. He admits that he did not read the objection himself nor did he make any suggestion to him as to what should be written in that objection. The statement of Shri Kalap Nath Singh is also, therefore, nor helpful to the petitioner in his behalf. Shri Udit Narain Sharma (P.W. 2) was also present in the counting hall as Election Agent of Shri Surendra Mohan. In his deposition he stated that he had requested the Returning Officer that rejected ballot papers should have been shown to him and that similar request were also made by other persons also but the Returning Officer did not show all the rejected ballot papers. He filed an objection before the Returning Officer, a certified copy of which is Ex. 3 on the record. A perusal of that objection disclosed that Shri Udit Narain Sharma did not state there in that only a few ballot papers had been shown to him and the remaining disputed ballot papers had not been shown to him. The objection pertained only to two ballot papers, which had been rejected. The petitioner's case is that 4 or 5 ballot papers were shown by the Returning Officer. Obviously, therefore, more than two rejected ballot papers were definitely shown to the persons present in the hall. However, the objection Ex. 2 pertained only two ballot papers and not to the other 2 or 3 ballot papers which admittedly had also been shown to the petitioner's counting agent and other persons present in the hall. Had the Returning Officer not shown all the ballot papers despite demands made by the interested persons, namely, the candidates, their election agents and counting agents, present in the hall at the time of counting, Shri Shakir Ali and Shri Sharma would have in normal course protested against the same and would have mentioned it in their objections which they had filed before the Returning Officer. The petitioner has also filed a certified copy of the objection filed by Sri Lakshmi Sahai Saxena, being Ex. 2 on the record. This document in my view, demolishes the petitioner's contention, Shri Lakshmi Sahai Saxena was a counting agent of Shri Narendra Singh. In his aforesaid objection he stated:—

"While the preliminary counting of ballot papers (for finding out the invalid ballot papers) was going on it was discovered that in 9 ballot papers there were some cuttings, in some at preference No. 8, in some at preference No. 9, and in some at preference No. 10. In one other ballot paper the figure '4' was written in bracket. In yet another ballot paper the votes has recounted his eleventh preference also but you are rejecting the same on the ground that it records two first preference votes."

This statement contained in Ex. 2 clearly shows that all eleven ballot papers were seen by Shri Lakshmi Sahai Saxena, otherwise how could he give details about those ballot papers. He pointed out that in nine ballot papers there were some cuttings. This shows that he had seen nine rejected ballot papers. Then he proceeded to state that in one other ballot paper the figure '4' was written in bracket. Thus he spoke about the 10th ballot paper. Further he stated that in yet

another ballot paper the voter had recorded 11th preference. This further indicates that he had seen the 11th ballot paper also. Had the returning officer not produced all the rejected ballot papers, how could Lakshmi Sahai Saxena write about them in his objection Ex. 2. Thus the document Ex. 2 filed by the petitioner herself belies her contention that only 4 or 5 rejected ballot papers had been shown to the candidates Counting Agents and Election Agents who were present in the hall. Sri S. P. Singh the Returning Officer, examined by the respondent No. 1 as his witness deposed that he had shown all the eleven disputed ballot papers to the candidates, Counting agents who sat in front of him in the hall. He stated that first of all he showed those 11 defective ballot papers to the persons concerned by holding them in his hand. Then certain person raised objection that they were not in a position to see those ballot papers from their seats, hence they were shown from a closer range. Then he asked his four or five Assistants each one to take one 4 defective ballot paper with him and show the same to the persons present in the room from a closer range without allowing any one to handle the same. His assistants showed those eleven defective ballot papers accordingly to the persons concerned. After seeing the ballot papers certain persons present in the room raised certain objections. The arguments were heard for and against, for about one and a half hours. After hearing the arguments, he rejected the said eleven ballot papers and endorsed his decision on each of the said ballot papers. He denied that he had shown only 4 or 5 defective ballot papers to the persons concerned. He was cross-examined at length but his testimony remained unshattered. His statement finds corroboration from the deposition of Sri P. K. Misra (P.W. 3) On the date of his deposition Sri P. K. Misra was Civil Defence Commissioner to Government of Bihar and Ex. Official Principal Secretary to the Government of Bihar, Urban Development and Housing Department. In the Election Commission he was initially secretary and then became Dy. Election Commissioner in June, 1977 in Delhi and continued as such till July, 1978. He was deputed as an observer for the election to the Raya Sabha which took place in March 1978 in Lucknow. He accordingly came to Lucknow on 28th March, 1978. He was present in the hall during the course of the counting of votes but he did not take any part in the work of the counting of votes. He sat in the hall behind the Returning Officer. According to him 11 votes were declared invalid. He gave out a procedure followed by the Returning Officer while counting the votes in question. The ballot papers were presented by the Assistant Returning Officers before the Returning Officer in bundles. They the Returning Officer scrutinised the bundles containing the valid votes and the doubtful votes. Thereafter the Returning Officer decided the validity of the valid votes and then kept in the bundle containing valid votes. The ballot papers containing doubtful votes were scrutinised one by one. The returning officer heard the objection of the parties regarding the validity of the votes and then recorded this decision on each ballot paper. According to the witness, it took nearly one and a half hours for the Returning Officer to decide about the validity of the doubtful ballot papers and after the Returning Officer had recorded his decision, 2 or 3 objections were filed subsequently but he could not remember at the time of his deposition, if any order was passed on those objections by the Returning Officer. An opportunity was given to all the candidates and election agents to see all the doubtful ballot papers. Initially when the Returning Officer was scrutinising the ballot papers, then the candidates or their agents were present in front of his table to see the ballot papers. Later on some body from amongst the candidates or his election agents stated that he as well as some others wanted to see ballot papers again and closely. then the Returning Officer requested all the people to sit down, gave some ballot papers to some members of the staff for taking the same around the hall to show to all the candidates and their agents who were present there. About 4 or 5 persons of the staff were engaged in showing the ballot papers around. Each one of these persons were given one ballot paper and he showed the paper around to the persons concerned. Thereafter he returned the ballot paper and another ballot paper was given to him. This was the procedure adopted in showing the ballot papers to the candidates and their agents. After they had seen the ballot papers they did not raise any objection about seeing the ballot papers. The testimony of this witness also remained unshattered in the cross-examination.

Sri Habibul Rahman Nomani (R.W. 1) and Sri Deo Bahadur Singh (R.W. 2) who were also present in the hall also deposed that all the eleven ballot papers were shown by the Returning Officer to the persons present in the hall at the time of the counting of votes. From the evidence adduced on behalf of the opposite party No. 1 as also from Ex. 2, it can legitimately be inferred that all the eleven rejected ballot papers were shown to the candidates, their counting agents and their election agents who were present in the counting hall at the time of counting of votes and the contention of the petitioner that only 4 or 5 such rejected ballot papers were shown is incorrect. I, therefore, hold that the Returning Officer did show all the defective ballot papers to the candidates or their election agents or counting agents before rejecting the same. The issue No. 4(a) is decided accordingly.

Issue No. 4(b) :

It has come in evidence of Sri P. K. Misra and Sri Satya Priya Singh that the decision on the defective 11 ballot papers was taken by the Returning Officer after hearing the arguments raised before him. The order on each of the aforesaid ballot paper was passed by the Returning Officer after hearing those arguments. Sri P. K. Misra has deposed that the Returning Officer took about one and a half hours in deciding the objections, hence it could not be said that the Returning Officer was in hurry in deciding the objections regarding the said rejected ballot papers. Sri Satya Priya Singh has stated likewise. He added that he did explain to the objectors as to under which rule he had rejected the ballot papers. According to him, he had rejected them under Rule 73 of the conduct of Election Rules. From the objections Exts. 1, 2 and 3 it also turns out that the Returning Officer did inform the reasons for rejecting the ballot papers in question, whether those reasons appealed to the objectors or not, was quite a different matter. I, therefore, hold that the Returning Officer did explain the reasons for rejecting the ballot papers. The issue No. 4(b) is decided accordingly.

Issue No. 7 :

The contention of the opposite party No. 1 is that a true copy of the election petition duly signed by the petitioner was not served on him. He has filed the copy of the petition which was served on him. It is Ex. A1 on the record, a perusal of which will show that his contention is meritless. On the first page of the said copy there is an endorsement reading "Attested True Copy" and below that endorsement appears the signature of the petitioner. Similarly on the last page of that copy of the petition i.e. page No. 14 the words "True Copy Attested" are typed and below these words appears the signature of the petitioner. A copy of the affidavit was also enclosed to the petition and on the last page thereof the words "T. C. Attested" are written and at the bottom appears the signature of the petitioner. The copy served on the opposite party No. 1 thus was signed by the petitioner and was also attested as true copy—Sub-Section (3) of Section 81 of the Representation of People Act, 1951, requires that every election petition shall be accompanied by as many copies thereof as there are respondents mentioned in the petition, and every such copy shall be attested by the petitioner under his own signature to be a true copy of the petition. In the case in hand the copy served on the opposite party No. 1 was attested by her under her own signature to be a true copy of the petition. Thus the compliance with the requirements of Sub-Section (3) of Section 81 of the Act had been made in the instant case. It was pointed out in 1964 Supreme Court, 1545, Kurarka Radhey Shyam, Ram Kumar Vs. Roop Singh Rathor and others, that the word 'copy' in sub-section (3) of Section 1 does not mean an absolutely exact copy but means that the copy shall be so true that no body can by any possibility misunderstand it. The test whether the copy is a true one is whether any variation from the original is calculated to mislead an ordinary person.

It could not be pointed out on behalf of the opposite party No. 1 that the copy of the petition served on his is not a true copy or that there are variations from the original which had misled him in any manner. In fact there are no such variations in the copies served on the opposite party No. 1 (Ex. A1). I, therefore, hold that a true copy of the election petition duly signed by the petitioner was served on the opposite party No. 1.

Issue No. 8 :

Section 83(1)(c) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 requires that an election petition shall be signed by the petitioner and verified in the manner laid down in the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for the verification of pleadings, provided that where the petitioner alleges any corrupt practice the petition shall also be accompanied by an affidavit in prescribed form of such corrupt practice and the particulars thereof. Sub-Section (2) of Section 83 of the Act requires that any schedule of Annexure to the petition shall also be signed by the petitioner and verified in the same manner as the petition.

At the outset it may be noticed that the petitioner has not challenged election of opposite party No. 1 on the ground of any corrupt practice. In fact she has not alleged any corrupt practice in her petition. Hence in my view it was not necessary that the petition should have been accompanied by any affidavit as required by the Proviso to clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 83 of the Act. The petitioner has, however, annexed her affidavit to the petition. The contention of the opposite party No. 1 was that neither the petition nor the affidavit had been verified in the manner laid down in the Code of Civil Procedure. In other words, the submission was that the petition had not been verified in the manner laid down in order VI, Rule 15 C.P.C. Similarly, the affidavit had also not been verified in the manner laid down in Rule 3 of Order XIX C.P.C. I find no force in the contention. The importance of verification is to test the genuineness and authenticity of the allegations and also to make the petitioner or the deponent responsible for the allegations made in the petition or the affidavit as the case may be. The petitioner has verified paragraphs 1 to 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19(a), 19(b), 20, 24, 25, and 26 of the petition on personal knowledge and paragraphs 9, 11, and 19 thereof to be true on the basis of the legal advise and paragraphs of ground Nos. 1, 2, 3 of paragraphs 6, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 23 as partly true to her knowledge and partly on the basis of legal advice which she believed to be true. This verification of the petition needs the requirement of Rule 15 of Order VI C.P.C. She has made similar verification of her affidavit annexed to the petition. That verification is also in conformity with Rule 3 of Order 19 C.P.C.

The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submitted that as the petitioner was not present at the time of counting, hence whatever she has stated in the petition regarding counting of votes cannot be within her own personal knowledge. The facts relating thereto must have been told by some body but that was not stated in the verification. Hence the verification was said to be bad in law. I do not find any force in this contention. Defect in verification is not to be judged by reading the relevant pleadings in the petition along with the counter pleadings in the written statement. The petitioner had verified the contents of certain paragraphs of the petition referred to hereinabove on personal knowledge. The fact that the petitioner could not have personal knowledge of those facts would not be a test for determining whether the verification has been made in accordance with the requirements of Rule 15 of Order VI C.P.C. When a person makes a verification of certain facts on the basis of personal knowledge he takes the responsibility of it, and the consequences may follow if the verification is found to be incorrect. It is one thing to say that the verification has not been made in accordance with the Rule 15 of Order VI, and it is quite different thing to say that the person, on evidence adduced, would be found not having the personal

knowledge of the fact. The opposite party No. 1 alleged that as the petitioner was not present in the counting hall at the time of the counting of votes and, therefore, she could not have the personal knowledge of the facts stated in the relevant paragraphs. But this could not exclude the possibility that she derived personal knowledge of the facts stated in the relevant paragraphs in some other way. Rule 15 merely requires that the petitioner should specify by reference to the number of paragraphs to the pleadings what he verifies to his own knowledge and what he verified upon the information received and believed to be true. The petitioner in the instant case did make the verification of the petition in accordance with his requirement. The issue is decided accordingly.

Issue No. 9 :

The petitioner has impugned the election of opposite party No. 1 only, and had not challenged the election of other opposite parties. It was not necessary for her to do so. The Returning Officer had admittedly calculated the requisite quota to be of the value of 3417. Since the opposite parties 2 to 11 received more than the quota, they were declared elected and the real contest thus remained between the petitioner and opposite party No. 1 for the 11th seat. The opposite party No. 1 in paragraph 10 of his written statement has admitted these facts. He has also stated that thereafter the Returning Officer proceeded under Rule 79 of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961 and found that the opposite party No. 1 got 25 first preference votes the value of which was 2500 whereas the petitioner had received only two first preference votes the value of which was 200. Thereafter the Returning Officer proceeded to transfer the surplus votes of the candidates who received highest number of votes in the first count, in the second round none got, so also upto 13th round. In the 14th round, the opposite party No. 1 was declared elected as the value of his ballot papers (votes) exceeded the value of ballot papers (votes) of all other continuing candidates, together with the surplus votes not transferred. The value of the ballot papers (votes) of the opposite party No. 1 came to 3322 and the value of the ballot papers (votes) of the petitioner to 3073. The real contest thus being between the petitioner and the opposite party No. 1, it was not necessary for the petitioner to challenge the election of the opposite parties 2 to 11 as well. The issue is decided accordingly.

Issue Nos. 10 & 11 :

For the reasons in the foregoing, the election of the opposite party No. 1 is not liable to be set aside and the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. These issues are decided accordingly.

In the result the petition fails and is dismissed. The opposite party No. 1 shall get Rs. 1000.00 (Rupees one thousand) as costs from the petitioner.

T. S. MISRA,

11th Dec. 1979.

[No. 82/UP/2/78]

By Order,

K. GANESAN, Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय
(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली 29, दिसम्बर, 1980

आय-कर

का०प्रा० 705.—संबंधानारण की जानकारी के लिये यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(iv) के माध्यम से प्रयोगित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (2-k) के प्रयोगितों के लिये नीचे विवरित अवधि के लिये अनुमोदित किया है :

प्रायोजक का नाम	मैसमं ज्योति लिमिटेड, बड़ोदा।
प्रायोजन स्थल	विरला विश्वकर्मा महाविद्यालय, (इंजीनियरिंग कालेज) वल्लभ विद्या नगर।
आरम्भ करने की प्रस्तावित तारीख	1-2-1980
पूरा होने की प्रस्तावित तारीख	1-2-1981
अनुमानित लागत	20,000 रु०

2. विरला विश्वकर्मा महाविद्यालय (इंजीनियरिंग कालेज) वल्लभ विद्या नगर, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) (ii) के अधीन अनुमोदित है, वैदिक वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, अधिसूचना सं. 2639 (फा०सं. 203/165/78-आई०टी०ए०-II) तारीख 6 जनवरी, 1979।

[सं. 3113/फा०सं. 203/174/79-आई०टी०(ए०-II)]

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Revenue)**

New Delhi, the 29th December, 1979

INCOME TAX

S.O. 705.—It is hereby notified for general information that the following scientific research programme has been approved for the period specified below for the purposes of sub-section 2(A) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 by the Secretary, Department of Science & Technology, New Delhi.

Name of the scientific Research programme	Study of Parameters for Optimum Selective Coatings Properties for Black Nickel and Black Chrome Surfaces.
Name of the sponsorer	M/s. Jyoti Limited, Baroda.
Sponsored at	Birla Vishvakarma Mahavidyalaya (Engineering College) Vallabh Vidya Nagar.
Proposed date of commencement.	1-2-1980.
Anticipated date of completion.	1-2-1981.
Estimated outlay	Rs. 20,000

2. The Birla Vishvakarma Mahavidyalaya (Engineering College) Vallabh Vidya Nagar, stands approved under Section 35(1) (ii) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 vide Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue Notification No. 2639 (F. No. 203/165/78-ITA.II) dated 6th January, 79.

[No. 3113/F. No. 203/174/79-JT(A.II)]

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1980

आय-कर

का०प्रा० 706.—संबंधानारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा, अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के छण्ड (ii), के प्रयोगितों के लिये चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में “वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान गोपनी” प्रवर्तन के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्—

- (i) यह कि केन्द्र चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक से रखेंगा।
- (ii) उक्त केन्द्र प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिये प्राप्त वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रक्रम में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोगित के लिये प्रधिकृत किये जायें और उसे सूचित किये जायें।
- (iii) उक्त केन्द्र परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष लेखांगों के सेवा परीक्षित वार्षिक कागज की एक प्रति 31 मई तक भेजेगा और इसके प्रतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भी भेजेगा।

संस्था

भारतीय चिकित्सा केन्द्र, मद्रास

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1979 से 30 दिसम्बर, 1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभारी होगी।

[सं. 3131/फा०सं. 203/5/80-प्राई०टी०(ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 706.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of “Scientific research association” in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) That the Centre will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the Centre will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the Centre will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

The Indian Medical Centre, Madras

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 31st December, 1979 to 30th December, 1982.

[No. 3131/F. No. 203/5/80-IT(A-II)]

नई दिल्ली, 17 जनवरी, 1980

आय-कर

का०प्रा० 707.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 1873, तारीख 16 जुलाई, 1977 के अनुक्रम में संवैधानारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा

अनुसंधान परिषद ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन" प्रबर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है:

- (1) यह कि समूत्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये संप्रह की गई निधियों का हिमाव अलग से रखेगा।
- (2) यह कि समूत्थान अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान मंबद्धी कियाकलार्पों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रलिप्तों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिये अधिकथित किये जायें और उसे सूचित किये जायें।
- (3) यह कि समूत्थान लेखांशों के लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक कथन की प्रति परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगा और इसके प्रतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति संबद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

भ्रष्टिल भारतीय हृदय समूत्थान, नई दिल्ली

यह अधिसूचना 16-7-79 से 15-7-82 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी रहेगी।

[मं० 3138/फा०मं० 203/7/80-आई०टी०(ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 17th January, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 707.—In continuation of this Department's notification No. 1873 dated 16th July, 1977, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the Foundation will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research,
- (ii) That the Foundation will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose,
- (iii) That the Foundation will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May, each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner,

INSTITUTION

All India Heart Foundation, New Delhi.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 16-7-79 to 15-7-82.

[No. 3138 /F. No. 203/7/80-IT (A-II)]

नई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1980

आयकर

का० आ० 708.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन" प्रबर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् —

- (1) यह कि वित्त प्रबन्ध और अनुसंधान संस्थान, मद्रास हारा इस छूट के अधीन संग्रहीत निधियों का उपयोग एकमात्र समाज चिकित्सा के अनुसंधान की उपति के लिये ही किया जायेगा;

(2) यह कि संस्थान इस छूट के अधीन संग्रह की गई निधियों का हिमाव अनुसंधान से रखेगा;

(3) यह कि मंस्थान छूट के अधीन एकव की गई निधियों का और वह वीति जिस में उनका उपयोग किया गया है अर्थात् दर्शन करने हुए लेखांशों का वार्षिक विवरण और वार्षिक रिपोर्ट भारतीय समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद् और सम्बद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

वित्त-प्रबन्ध और अनुसंधान संस्थान, मद्रास

यह अधिसूचना तारीख 1-4-79 से 31-3-82 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी रहेगी।

[सं० 3139/फा० सं० 203/29/79-आई०टी०(ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 708.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, subject to the following conditions:—

- (1) The funds collected by the Institute for Financial Management and Research, Madras, under this exemption will be utilized, exclusively for promotion of research in Social Sciences.
- (2) That the Institute shall maintain separate accounts of the funds collected by them under the exemption.
- (3) That the Institute shall send annual statement of accounts and annual report to the Indian Council of Social Science Research as well as to the concerned Commissioner of Income-tax, showing the funds collected by them under the exemption and the manner in which the funds were utilized.

INSTITUTION

Institute for Financial Management & Research, Madras
This notification is effective for a period of three years from 1-4-79 to 31-3-82.

[No. 3139/F. No. 203/29/78-IT(A-II)]

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1980

आयकर

का० आ० 709.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन" प्रबर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् —

- (1) यह कि सोसाइटी चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त गणियों का हिसाब पृष्ठ से रखेगी।
- (2) उस सोसाइटी प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबद्धी चिकित्साओं की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रलिप्तों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिये अधिकथित किये जायें और उसे सूचित किये जायें।

(3) उक्त सोसाइटी प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिये लेखापरीक्षित वार्षिक कथन की एक प्रति परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगी और इसकी एक प्रति संबद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भी भेजेगी।

संस्था

दि मस्कुलर डिस्ट्रोफी सोसाइटी, मुम्बई

यह अधिसूचना 31-12-1979 से 30-12-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रवस्त होगी।

[सं. 3145/फा०सं. 203/8/80-आई०टी० (ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 709.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- That the Society will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- That the Society will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- That the Society will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

The Muscular Dystrophy Society, Bombay
This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 31-12-79 to 30-12-1982.

[No. 3145/F. No. 203/8/80-IT(A.II)]

आय-कर

का०प्रा० 710.—मर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये विकिसा अनुसंधान के लोक में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

संस्था

फारोमेंडल इंडिग प्राइवेट (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, मद्रास।

यह अधिसूचना 8-12-1978 से 7-12-1980 तक दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी रहेगी।

[सं. 3160/फा०सं. 203/193/78-आई०टी० (ए०-II)]

INCOME TAX

S.O. 710.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

INSTITUTION

Coromendal Indag Products (P) Ltd., Madras

This notification is effective for a period of 2 years from 8-12-1978 to 7-12-1980.

[No. 3160/F. No. 203/193/78-IT(A.II)]

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवरी, 1980

आय-कर

का०प्रा० 711.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 2073 (का० सं. 203/172/77-आई०टी० पा०-II), तारीख 15 दिसम्बर, 1977 के अनुक्रम में सर्वाधारण की जानकारी के लिये अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात्, भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर अधिनियम, 1962 के तियम् 6(ii) के माथ पठिन, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये विकिसा अनुसंधान के लोक में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- यह कि संस्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के लोक में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक से रखेगा।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रूफों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिये अधिकारित किये जायें और ऐसे मूल्यित किये जायें।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिये लेखापरीक्षित वार्षिक कथन की एक प्रति परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगा तथा इसकी एक प्रति संबद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भी भेजेगा।

संस्था

रामकृष्ण मिशन सेवा प्रतिष्ठान, विवेकानन्द चिकित्सा विज्ञान संस्थान, कलकत्ता।

यह अधिसूचना 17-11-1979 से 16-11-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी होगी।

[सं. 3162/फा०सं. 203/17/80-आई०टी० (ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 711.—In continuation of this Department's notification No. 2073 (F. No. 203/172/77-IT A.II) dated 15th December, 1977, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- That the Institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- That the Institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- That the Institute will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

Ramakrishna Mission Seva Pratishthan, Vivekananda Institute of Medical Sciences, Calcutta.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 17-11-79 to 16-11-1982.

[No. 3162/F. No. 203/17/80-IT (A.II)]

आय-कर

का०आ० 712.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, प्रथम् भागीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के बाण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिये अनुमोदित किया है।

संस्था

एमोमिटेड एन्ड कॉल्चरल फाउन्डेशन, नई दिल्ली।

यह प्रधिसूचना 27-4-79 से 26-4-81 तक दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3163/फा०सं० 203/86/79-प्राई०टी०(ए०-II)]

INCOME TAX

S.O. 712.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

INSTITUTION

Associated Agricultural Development Foundation,
New Delhi.

This notification is effective for a period of 2 years from 27-4-79 to 26-4-1981.

[No. 3163/F. No. 203/86/79-IT(A.II)]
नई दिल्ली 7 फरवरी, 1980

आय-कर

का०आ० 713.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 1690 तारीख 26-3-77 के अनुक्रम में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, प्रथम् सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(iv) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के बाण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अन्य प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में “संगम” प्रवर्ती के अधीन निम्नलिखित गतौ पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) यह कि सी० सी० श्राफ अनुसंधान संस्थान प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक (कृषि/पशुपालन/मान्यकी और धौषधि से भिन्न) विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त गणियों का हिमाव पृथक से रखेगा।
- (2) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी किया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 30 अप्रैल तक ऐसे प्रत्येक में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकाधिक किया जाए और उसे सूचित किया जाए।

संस्था

सी० सी० श्राफ संस्थान, नई दिल्ली

यह प्रधिसूचना 13-10-79 से 12-10-1980 तक एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3180/फा० सं० 203/149/79 प्राई०टी० (ए०-II)]

New Delhi, the 7th February, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 713.—In continuation of the Department's notification No. 1690 dated 26-3-77, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Secretary, Department of Science & Technology, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-

tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Association" in the area of natural or applied sciences, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) that the C. C. Shroff Research Institute, will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of natural or applied sciences (other than Agriculture/Animal Husbandry/Fisheries & Medicines.)
- (ii) That the said Institute will furnish the annual return of its Scientific Research Activities to the prescribed authority for every financial year in such forms as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose, by 30th April, each year.

INSTITUTION

C. C. Shroff Institute, New Delhi

This notification is effective for a period of one year from 13-10-79 to 12-10-1980.

[No. 3180/F. No. 203/149/79-IT(A.II)]

आय-कर

का०आ० 714.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, प्रथम् सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(iv) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के बाण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अन्य प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में “संगम” प्रवर्ती के अधीन निम्नलिखित गतौ पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) यह कि शाह औद्योगिक अनुसंधान संस्थान वाराणसी प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक (कृषि/पशुपालन/मान्यकी और धौषधि से भिन्न) विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त गणियों का हिमाव पृथक से रखेगा।
- (2) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी किया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 30 अप्रैल तक ऐसे प्रत्येक में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकाधिक किया जाए और उसे सूचित किया जाए।

संस्था

शाह औद्योगिक अनुसंधान संस्थान, वाराणसी

यह प्रधिसूचना 5-11-71 से 4-11-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3181/फा० सं० 203/136/79 प्राई०टी० (ए०-II)]

INCOME TAX

S.O. 714.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Secretary, Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category "Association" in the area of other natural or applied sciences, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) that the Sah Industrial Research Institute, Varanasi, will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of natural or applied sciences (other than agriculture/animal husbandry/fisheries and medicines).

- (ii) That the said Association will furnish the annual return of its scientific research activities to the prescribed authority for every financial year in such forms as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose, by 30th April, each year.

INSTITUTION

Sah Industrial Research Institute, Varanasi.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 5-11-79 to 4-11-1982.

[No. 3181/F. No. 203/136/79-IT(A. II)]

आधिकारी

कांस्ट्रॉ 715.—सर्वेसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संघर्ष को आवश्यक नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(4) के माध्यम से अधिकारी, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, 1961 की धारा 35 की अधारा (1) के बायण (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अन्य प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में “संगम” प्रबर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शहरों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) यह कि सीताराम भारतीय वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संस्थान नई दिल्ली प्राकृतिक या अनुप्रयोगिक (कृषि/पशुपालन/मास्त्राकी और श्रीपथि से भिन्न) विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए, प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक से रखेगा।
- (2) उक्त संगम प्रत्येक विनाय अर्थ के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी त्रिया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 30 अप्रैल तक ऐसे प्रस्त॑पों से प्रस्तुत करेगा जो हम प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकारित किए जाएँ और उसे सूचित किए जाएँ।

संघर्ष

सीताराम भारतीय वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगठन, नई दिल्ली

यह अधिसूचना 11-12-1979 से 10-12-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं. 3183/कां. सं. 203/170/79-आई० दी० (प० II)]

जै० पौ० शर्मा, निदेशक

INCOME TAX

S.O. 715.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Secretary, Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category “Association” in the area of other natural or applied sciences, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) that Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Scientific Research, New Delhi, will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of natural or applied sciences (other than agriculture/animal husbandry/fisheries and medicines).
- (ii) that the said Association will furnish the annual return of its scientific research activities to the prescribed authority for every financial year in such forms as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose, by 30th April, each year.

INSTITUTION

Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Scientific Research, New Delhi.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 11-12-1979 to 10-12-1982.

[No. 3183/F. No. 203/170/79-IT(A. II)]

J. P. SHARMA, Director

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी 1980

कांस्ट्रॉ 716—भारतीय अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 269-ब की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और दिनांक 10 अगस्त 1979 की अधिसूचना संख्या 62/79-फा० सं० 316/180/79-धन कर का अधिलंगन करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार एवं दिल्ली अधिकारी प्रादेश देती है कि निम्नलिखित मार्गी में उल्लिखित क्षेत्र निरीक्षक महायक आयुक्त (अधिकारी) जालन्धर के अधिकार द्वेष के अन्तर्गत आयेंगे।

सारिणी

निरीक्षी सहायक आयुक्त पंजाब के जालन्धर, कपूरथला, (प्रभिग्रहण रेंज) जालन्धर, होशियारपुर, भटिंडा, किरोजपुर नथा करीदकोट जिले।

यह आदेश दिनांक 30 नवम्बर 1979 के अपराह्न से साग्रह होगा।

[सं. 3159/कां. सं. 316/842/79-धन कर]

एम० आर० गुप्ता, अवर भवित्व

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1980

S.O. 716.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 269B of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of notification No. 62/79-F. No. 316/180/79-WT dated 10-8-79, the Central Government hereby order that Inspecting Assistant Commissioner (Acquisition), Jullundur shall have jurisdiction over the areas as mentioned in the following Table :

TABLE

Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Acquisition Range, Jullundur.	Jullundur, Kapurthala, Hoshiarpur, Bhatinda, Ferozepur and Faridkot Districts of Punjab.
--	--

This order shall come into force with effect from 30-11-1979 After Noon.

[No. 3159/F. No. 316/842/79- T]
S. R. GUPTA, Under Secy.

(आधिकारिक कार्य विभाग)

(वैकाश प्रधान)

नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 1980

कांस्ट्रॉ 717—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण वैकाश प्रधानियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार, एवं दिल्ली शहरी आयुक्त द्वारा दिल्ली शहरी आयुक्त को अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 12 मार्च, 1980 से प्रायम् होकर 11 मार्च, 1983 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के समाप्त में विद्यार्थिन तरीके द्वारा श्री आई० एच० दरबाजकर अध्यक्ष के समाप्त में कार्य करेंगे।

[संघर्ष एफ०-१-१/८०-आर० आर० शी०]

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1980

S.O. 717.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri I. H. Darwajkar as the Chairman of the Durg-Rajnandgaon Gramin Bank, Rajnandgaon and specifies the period commencing on the 12th March, 1980 and ending with the 11th March, 1983 as the period for which the said Shri I. H. Darwajkar shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 1-1/80-RRB]

नई दिल्ली, 13 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 718.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एनद्वारा श्री विष्णुकान्त खान को सिधिया क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, दरभंगा का प्रबन्धक नियुक्त करती है ज्यादा 14 मार्च, 1980 से प्रारम्भ होकर 13 मार्च, 1983 को समाप्त होने वाली प्रथम को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दोगल श्री विष्णुकान्त खान उक्त बैंक के अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[मंच्या एफ० 1/23/79-आर०आर०बी०]
विनेश अनंद, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 13th March, 1980

S.O. 718.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Vishnu Kant Khan as the Chairman of the Mithila Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Darbhanga and specifies the period commencing on the 14th March, 1980 and ending with the 13th March, 1983 as the period for which the said Shri Vishnu Kant Khan shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 1-23/79-RRB]

DINESH CHANDRA, Director

केन्द्रीय प्रबन्धक कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 8 नवम्बर, 1979

प्राय-कर

का० आ० 719.—केन्द्रीय प्रबन्ध कर बोर्ड, प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर यथासंघोषित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 679 [का० सं० 187/2/74-आयकर (प-1)], तारीख 20-7-74 से उपायकर अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

कम सं० 21-क और 21-ड के मामने स्तम्भ (1), (2) और (3) के नीचे, विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएँगी, अर्थात् :—

प्रायसूची

प्राय-कर मुद्रायात्मक प्रशिकारिता

प्रायुक्ति

1

2

3

"21-क नमिलनाडु-II मद्रास 1. सम्पदा शूलक तथा आयकर शक्ति, मद्रास
2. " " " " " " घंजाबूर
3. " " " " " " कोयम्बटूर
4. " " " " " " मुद्रूर।

1 2 3

5. वेल्लूर सर्किल
6. काम्पनी सर्किल-II, मद्रास
7. मनेम सर्किल-I
8. मनेम सर्किल-II
9. काम्पनी सर्किल, मनेम
10. कृष्ण परिं मर्किल
11. नगर सर्किल-4, मद्रास

21-E. कोयम्बटूर	कोयम्बटूर	1. नगर सर्किल-I, कोयम्बटूर
		2. " " -II, "
		3. " " -III, "
		4. काम्पनी सर्किल I, II, III, IV और V कोयम्बटूर
		5. विशेष सर्वेक्षण सर्किल, कोयम्बटूर
		6. वेतन सर्किल, कोयम्बटूर
		7. उटकमाण्ड सर्किल
		8. पोल्लची सर्किल
		9. तिळपुर सर्किल
		10. द्विंड सर्किल"

यह प्रधिसूचना 15-11-79 से प्रभावी होगी।

[मं० 3063/का० सं० 187/25/79-आय कर (प-1)]

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 8th November, 1979

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 719.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 679/(F. No. 187/2/74-IT(A1) dated 20-7-74 as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under columns (1), (2) and (3) against Sl. Nos. 21-A and 21-E shall be substituted by the following entries :—

SCHEDULE

Commissioner of Income tax	Head Quarter,	Jurisdiction
21-A. Tamil Nadu-II	Madras	1. ED-Cum-IT Circle,
		2. ED-Cum-IT Thanjavur,
		3. ED-cum-IT Coimbatore,
		4. Ed-cum-IT Circle, Madurai,
		5. Vellore Circle.
		6. Company Circle-II, Madras,
		7. Salem Circle-I
		8. Salem Circle-II
		9. Company Circle, Salem,
		10. Krishnagiri Circle.
		11. City Circle-IV, Madras.

21E Coimbatore	Coimbatore.	1. City Circle-I, Coimbatore. 2. City Circle-II, Coimbatore. 3. City Circle-III, Coimbatore. 4. Company Circle-I, II, III, IV, & V, Coimbatore. 5. Spl. Survey Circle, Coimbatore. 6. Salary Circle, Coimbatore. 7. Ootacamund circle. 8. Pollachi Circle. 9. Tiruppur Circle. 10. Erode Circle.
----------------	-------------	--

This notification shall take effect from 15-11-79.

[No. 3063/F. No. 187/25/79-IT (A1)]

नई दिल्ली, 29 नवम्बर, 1979

आयकर

फा० आ० 720:—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 फा० 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा(1) द्वारा प्रदत्त समितियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 679 (फा० सं० 187/2/74 आ० क(ए-1) तारीख 20 जूलाई, 1974 से उपायकर अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधित करती है, अर्थात् :—

अम सं० 5, 5व और 6म के सामने स्थान (1), (2) और (3) में विशेषान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

अनुसूची

आयकर अनुसूची	मृद्यानय	अधिकारिता
(1)	(2)	(3)
"5 मुम्बई शहर-I	मुम्बई	1. कम्पनी सकिल-I 2. मुम्बई सकिल 3. धूतिक सकिल बहुतर मुम्बई की क्षेत्रीय अधिकारिता के भीतर, उन मामलों को छोड़ कर जो सर्वेक्षण सकिल-I—और II में निर्धारणीय है, चिकित्सा वृत्ति करते वाले और वकील, अधिकारक सोसीटीटर, रजिस्ट्रीशन नेत्रापाल, नागर नेत्रापाल, आयकर-न्यवसायी और हांगीनियर, वास्तुकार और प्रबंध-परामर्शी के रूप में कार्य कर रहे सभी अधिकारियों के सामने। 4. विशेष सकिल-III
		5. मुम्बई शहर × मुम्बई मुम्बई

(1)	(2)	(3)
5-व मुम्बई शहर-III	मुम्बई	1. कम्पनी सकिल-III 2. विदेशी कम्पनी सकिल-II 3. ध-वाई—सड़क परिवहन प्रशालक के रूप में कारबाह करते वाले सभी अधिकारियों के सामने और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के उपबंधों के प्रवीन किसी आदेश या किन्हीं आदेशों द्वारा समनुवेशित ऐसे निर्धारितियों के सभी मामले जिनके कारबाह या दृष्टि के मुख्य स्थान आयकर अनुसूची मुम्बई शहर-III मुम्बई की स्थानीय अधिकारिता में स्थित है और जो आयकर अनुसूची मुम्बई शहर-III, मुम्बई के प्रभार के प्रधीन निर्धारित किए गए हैं या निर्धारित है या उन मामलों को छोड़ कर जो सर्वेक्षण सकिल-I और II में निर्धारित है, ऐसे निर्धारितियों के सभी मामले जो आयकर अनुसूची मुम्बई शहर-III, मुम्बई के प्रभार में, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबंधों के प्रधीन या आयकर अधिनियम, 1922 के तत्स्थानी उपबंधों के धर्मीन या आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के किन्हीं इन्हीं उपबंधों के प्रधीन किए गए आदेश या आदेशों द्वारा विशेष रूप से उसे सौंपे गये हैं। 4. फिल्म सकिल, मुम्बई 5. विशेष सकिल-III 6. आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 में यथापरिभाषित सभी कम्पनियों जिनके कारबाह या बूलि अथवा व्यवसाय के मुख्य स्थान, निम्नलिखित वार्ष/सकिल/जिले की स्थानीय अधिकारिता में स्थित हैं और जिन पर इस समय मुम्बई स्थित किसी अन्य आयकर अधिकारिता नहीं है :— क-I वाई] क-II वाई क-III वाई क-IV वाई क-V वाई
		1. ग-III वाई 2. घ-III वाई 3. शी एस शी (परिवर्त्त)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
4. बो एस बी (उत्तर)					Accountants, Income-tax Practitioner's and as Engineers, Architects and Management Consultants in the territorial limits of Greater Bombay except those cases which are assessable in Survey Circle-I & II.
5. विदेशी प्रतिवादी					
6. सर्वेक्षण संकिल I और II जो मुख्यतर मुम्हई की स्वातीय सीमाओं के भीतर ऐसे सभी नए मामलों में कार्रवाई करते हैं जिनका अब तक प्राप्तकर के के लिए निष्पारिण नहीं थुमा है और जिनकी 1 दिसंबर, 1979 से पूर्व और माय-विवरणी प्रस्तुत नहीं की गई है, उन मामलों को छोड़कर जो निम्नलिखित की अधिकारिता के भीतर निष्पारिण किए गए हैं निष्पारिण—					
	(i) बेतन शाखा-I				4. Special Circle-I,
	(ii) बेतन शाखा-II				5B. Bombay City-III Bombay.
	(iii) व्याप संकिल				1. Companies Circle-III
	(iv) कम्पनी संकिल-I से VI				2. Foreign Companies Circle-II.
	(v) विदेश कम्पनी संकिल I और II				3. X-Ward dealing with cases of all persons carrying on business as road transport operators and all cases assigned by any order or orders under the provisions of I.T. Act, 1961 of the assessee having their principal place of business or profession in territorial jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Bombay City-III, Bombay and who are assessed or assessable in Commissioner of Income-tax, Bombay City-III, Bombay charge or assessee whose cases are specifically assigned to the charge of Commissioner of Income-tax, Bombay City-III
	(vi) अनिवासी प्रतिवादी संकिल				Bombay by virtue of any order or orders under the provisions of the I.T. Act, 1961 or under the corresponding provisions of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 and any other provisions of the I.T. Act, 1961, except those cases which are assessable in Survey Circle-I & II.
	(vii) मुम्हई प्रतिवादी संकिल I				

यह घोषणा 1-12-1979 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं. 3079/का. सं. 187/21/79-प्रा.का. (पा-1)]

New Delhi, the 29th November, 1979

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 720.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 679 (I. No. 187/2/74-IT(A)) dated 20th July, 1974, as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under Columns (1), (2) & (3) against Serial Nos. 5, 5B and 51 shall be substituted by the following entries—

SCHEDULE

Commissioner of Income tax	Head Quarters	Jurisdiction
(1)	(2)	(3)
5. Bombay City-I	Bombay	1. Companies Circle-I
		2. Bombay Circle.
		3. Professionals Circle-dealing with cases of all persons, engaged in the carrying on of medical profession and profession as lawyers, Advocates, Solicitors, Registered Accountants, Cost-
		4. Film Circle, Bombay.
		5. Special Circle III.
		6. All Companies as defined in the Income-tax Act, 1961 having principal place of

(1)

(2)

(3)

business or profession or vocation in the territorial jurisdiction of the following Wards/Circles/ Districts and over which no other Commissioner at Bombay hold jurisdiction at present.

A-I Ward,

A-II Ward,

A-III Ward,

A-IV Ward,

A-V Ward.

51. Bombay City-X. Bombay.

1. C-III Ward.
 2. B-III Ward.
 3. B.S.D. (West).
 4. B.S.D. (North).
 5. Foreign Section.
 6. Survey Circles I & II—dealing with all new cases not hitherto assessed to Income tax and where no return of income has been filed before the first day of December, 1979, in the territorial limits of Greater Bombay except those cases assessed/assessable within the jurisdiction of—
 (i) Salaries Branch-I.
 (ii) Salaries Branch-II.
 (iii) Trust Circle.
 (iv) Companies Circles-I to VI.
 (v) Foreign Companies Circles I & II.
 (vi) Non-resident Refund Circle.
 (vii) Bombay Refund Circle."

This notification shall take effect from 1-12-1979.

[No. 3079/F. No. 187/21/-79-IT (A-I)]

मई दिल्ली, 27 विसंवत्त, 1979

धायकर

का० घा० 721.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, धायकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 126 द्वारा प्रवत्त संस्थायों का प्रयोग करते हुए, प्रधिसूचना सं० 1189 [का० सं० 187/17/75-धार्या० दी (ए-1)], तारीख 1 जनवरी, 1976 से उपावद अनुद्धावी की कम सं० 82 से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों को, जो प्रधिसूचना सं० 1 (का० सं० 53/233/63-धार्या० दी), तारीख 18 मई, 1984 द्वारा सम्मापित की गई थी, निकालता है।

[सं० 3110/का० सं० 185/374/79-धार्या० दी० (ए-1)]

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1979

INCOME TAX

S.O. 721.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby deletes the entries pertaining to Sl. No. 82 of the Schedule annexed to Notification No. 1(F. No. 55/233/63-IT), dated the 18th May, 1964, inserted by Notification No. 1189 [F. No. 187/17/75-IT(AI)] dated the 1st January, 1976.

[No. 3110/F. No. 185/374/79-IT(AI)]

मई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1980

(धायकर)

का० घा० 722.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, धाय कर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80-छ की उपधारा (2)(ब) द्वारा प्रवत्त संस्थायों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री प्रमथ वेंकटेम पेठमन संस्थाधिक वेलुकुड़ी, मध्य गुजराती तालुक, जिला तंजोर, तमिल नाडु थों, उक्त धारा के प्रयोगतार्तों के लिए तमिल नाडु राज्य में संबंधित सांवेदनिक पृष्ठा के स्थान के रूप में प्रधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 3142 का० सं० 176/38/79-धार्या० दी० (ए-1)]

बी० एम० सिंह, धायकर सचिव।

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1980

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 722.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2)(b) of Section 80G of the Income-tax Act, 1961, (43 of 1961) the Central Government hereby notifies Sri Prasanna Venkatesa Perumal Sannidhi Velukkudi, Mannargudi Taluk, Tanjore District, Tamil Nadu to be a place of public worship of renown throughout the State of Tamil Nadu for the purposes of the said Section.

[No. 3142/F. No. 176/38/79-IT(AI)]

B. M. SINGH, Under Secy.

मई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 1980

(धायकर)

का० घा० 723.—धायकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 194 की उपधारा (3) के अन्तर्गत (ब) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय संस्कार, एतद्वारा, प्रताप स्पिनिंग, बीकिंग एंड मैन्यूफैक्चरिंग कम्पनी लिमिटेड, प्रमलेश्वर को उक्त उप-व्याप के प्रयोगानन के लिये प्रधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० का० सं० 275/71/79-धायकर (धर्म)]

एस० धार० वधवा, उप सचिव।

New Delhi, the 28th February, 1980

INCOME TAX

S.O. 723.—In pursuance of sub-clause (f) of clause (iii) of sub-section (3) of section 194A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies the Pratap Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company Limited, Amalner, for the purpose of the said sub-clause.

[No. F. No. 275/71/79-IT(B)]

S. R. WADHWA, Dy. Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

मई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 1980

धायकर

का० घा० 724.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, धायकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवत्त संस्थायों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस संबंध में सभी पूर्वतन प्रधिसूचनाओं को प्रधिसूचित करते हुए, यह निवेद देता है कि भीषि की अनुद्धावी में संघर्ष (1) में विनिविष्ट रेजों के सहायक धायकर धायुक्त (प्रील), उसके संघर्ष (2) में तक्षस्मद्धर्मी प्रविष्ट में विनिविष्ट धायकर सक्षिणों,

बाढ़ी और जिलों में आयकर से निर्धारित सभी व्यक्तियों और आयों के बारे में उस सभी व्यक्तियों और आयों को छोड़कर जिनकी वास्तव अधिकारिता आयकर आयुक्त (प्रपील) में निहित है अपने हृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (प्रपील)

अनुसूची

रेज	आयकर संकिल/वार्ड और जिले
1	2
1. गोहाटी रेज, गोहाटी	(1) आयकर विशेष संकिल, गोहाटी। (2) सर्वेषण संकिल के सभी वार्ड, गोहाटी। (3) गोहाटी, नलबाड़ी, बुबरी, इम्फाल, दीमापुर, शिल्पचर, कटीमगांव और अगरतला आयकर संकिलों के सभी वार्ड।
2. डिब्रुगढ़ रेज. डिब्रुगढ़	(1) आयकर केन्द्रीय संकिल, डिब्रुगढ़। (2) सम्पूर्ण शुल्क तथा आयकर संकिल, डिब्रुगढ़। (3) डिब्रुगढ़, डिमोही, तिनसुखिया, जोरहाट, गोमाखाट, सिलसागर, नोगांव और नेजपुर आयकर संकिलों के सभी वार्ड।

जहाँ कोई आयकर संकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेज से किसी अन्य रेज को अन्तरित हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर संकिल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस रेज के, जिससे वह आयकर संकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित हुआ है, सहायक आयुक्त (प्रपील) के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व संवित अपीलें उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उस रेज के, जिसको उक्त संकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित हुआ है, सहायक आयुक्त (प्रपील) को अन्तरित की जाएगी और वही उस पर कार्यवाही करेगा।

यह अधिसूचना 15-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3125(फा० सं० 261/25/78-मार्फ टी जे)]

(CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES)

New Delhi, The 11th January, 1980

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 724.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in Column (1) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and income assessed to Income-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax over which the jurisdiction vests in Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals).

APPELLATE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS SCHEDULE

Range	Income-tax	Circle/Wards & Districts.
1	2	3
1. Gauhati Range Gauhati	(i) Income-tax Special Circle, Gauhati. (ii) All Wards of Survey Circle, Gauhati. (iii) All Wards of Income-tax Circles, Gauhati, Halbari, Dhubri, Imphal, Dimapur, Shillong, Silchar, Karimganj and Agartala.	
2. Dibrugarh Range, Dibrugarh.	(i) Income-tax Central Circle, Dibrugarh. (ii) E.D. Cum I.T. Circle, Dibrugarh. (iii) All Wards of Income-tax Circles, Dibrugarh, Digboi, Tinsukia, Jorhat, Golaghat, Sibsagar, Nowgong and Tezpur.	

Where any Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range appeals arising out of the assessments orders made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom the Income-tax Circle Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date of this notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 15-1-1980.

[No. 3125 (F. No. 261/25/78-ITJ)]

फा० घा० 725.—केन्द्रीय प्रश्नकार कर बोई, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की घारा 121-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त व्यक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इसके पूर्व जारी की गई अधिसूचना के अंशिक उपान्तरण में, यह निर्देश देता है कि नीचे अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट भारसाधनों के आयकर आयुक्त (प्रपील), उसके स्तम्भ (2) और (3) में तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविलियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर वार्ड, संकिल, जिलों और रेजों में आयकर का व्यापकर से निर्धारित ऐसे व्यक्तियों के बारे में, जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की घारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खंड (क) से (ज) तक, कम्पनी (लाल) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की घारा 2 की उपधारा (1) और व्याजकर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की घारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में उल्लिखित किसी भी आदेशों से अवित्त है, और ऐसे व्यक्तियों या व्यक्तियों के वारों की वास्तव भी, जिनके लिए बोई ने आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की घारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खंड (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार निरेश दिया है या अवित्त में निरेश दे, हृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

अनुसूची

भारसाधन और मुद्यालय	आयकर वार्ड और संकिल	सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण के रेज)
1	2	3
प्रायुक्त (प्रपील) 1—नई दिल्ली	1. कम्पनी संकिल II, VII, XV, XVI और XX	1. सहायक प्रायुक्त (निरीक्षण), निर्धारण रेज 1 ड, नई दिल्ली
	2. विशेष संकिल—XV	

1	2	3
3. येतन सकिल	2. सहायक आयुक्त	आयुक्त
4. प्राइवेट येतन सकिल	निरीक्षण निर्धारण रेंज-	
5. टी बी एस (धारा 206)	1 च, नई दिल्ली ।	सकिल ।
आयुक्त (भरील)-III, नई दिल्ली	सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण), रेंज II-ब्स, II-ग, II-घ, II-क, II-च और II-छ नई दिल्ली की अधिकारिता के अधीन सभी वार्ड/सकिल	सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण रेंज 1-ज, नई दिल्ली
आयुक्त (भरील)-IV, नई दिल्ली	सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण), रेंज IV-क, JV-ग, JV-झ और JV-ज, नई दिल्ली की अधि- कारिता के अधीन सभी वार्ड/सकिल	सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण JV-छ, नई दिल्ली
आयुक्त (भरील)-VI, नई दिल्ली	1. कम्पनी सकिल— 2. जिला III-क में सभी वार्ड 3. जिला III-घ में सभी वार्ड 4. जिला III-छ में सभी वार्ड	1. सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण रेंज-III-क, नई दिल्ली 2. सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण रेंज-III-घ, नई दिल्ली 3. सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण रेंज-III-छ, नई दिल्ली
आयुक्त (भरील)-VII, नई दिल्ली	नहीं प्रायकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) रेंज V-क, V-ब्स, V-ग, V-य और V-छ, नई दिल्ली की अधिकारिता के अधीन सभी वार्ड/सकिल	1. सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) निर्धारण रेंज V-ज, नई दिल्ली

जहां कोई प्रायकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक भारताधन से किसी अन्य भारताधन को अन्तरित हो जाता है, वहां उस प्रायकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस भारताधन के, जिससे वह प्रायकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित हुआ है, प्रायकर आयुक्त के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व लंबित अपीलें उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उस भारताधन के, जिसको उक्त सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित हुआ है, प्रायकर आयुक्त को अन्तरित की जाएगी और वही उस पर कार्यवाही करेगा।

यह अधिसूचना 14-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं. 3126 (फांसं. 261/18/79-पार्ट दी जे)]

S.O. 725.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification of the notification issued earlier, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby direct that the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) of the charges specified in Col. 1 of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Sur-tax or Interest-tax in the Income-tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in columns (2)

and Col. (3) thereof as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 in sub-section (1) of Section-II of Companies (Profits) Sur-tax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964) and in sub-section(1) of Section 15 of the Interest-tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with provisions of clause (i) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961:—

SCHEDULE

Charges with Headquarters	Income-tax-Wards/Circles and Districts.	Range of Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax.
1	2	3
Commissioners (Appeals)-I, New Delhi.	1. Company Circles-II, VII, XV, XVI and XX. 2. Special Circle-XV 3. Salary Circles 4. Private Salary Circles 5. T.D.S. (Section 206) Circles.	1. I.A.C. Assessment Range-I E, New Delhi. 2. I. A. C. Assessment Range-IF, New Delhi.
Commissioners (Appeals)-III, New Delhi.	All Wards/Circles within the jurisdiction of I.A.C. of Income-tax, Range-II-B, II-C II-D, II-E, II-F & II-G, New Delhi.	1. I. A. C. Assessment Range-II H, New Delhi.
Commissioners (Appeals)-IV, New Delhi.	All Wards/Circles within the jurisdiction of I.A.C.s, of Income-tax Ranges-IV-A, IV-C, IV-E & IV-F, New Delhi.	1. I. A. C. Assessment Range-IV-G New Delhi.
Commissioners (Appeals)-VI, New Delhi.	1. Company Circle-IX 2. All Wards in Distt. III-A 3. All Wards in Distt. III-B 4. All Wards in Distt. III-E	1. I. A. C. Assessment Range-III-E, New Delhi. 2. I. A. C. Assessment Range-III-F, New Delhi. 3. I. A. C. Assessment Range-III-C, New Delhi.
Commissioners (Appeals)-VII, New Delhi.	All Wards/Circles within the jurisdiction of IACs of Income-tax Ranges-V-A, V-B, V-C, V-D, & V-E, New Delhi.	1. I. A. C. Assessment Range-V-F, New Delhi.

Whereas an Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one Charge to another Charge, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circles, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Commissioner of Income-tax of the Charge from whom the Income-tax Circle, Ward, or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date of this Notification taken effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Commissioner of Income-tax of the Charge to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 14-1-1980.

[No. 3126 (F. No. 261/18/79-ITJ)]

का० घा० 726.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर थोड़े, आयकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली सभी अन्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और इस सम्बन्ध में सभी पूर्वतन प्रधिसूचनाओं को प्रधिकान्त करते हुए, निदेश देता है कि सीधे प्रान्तसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिविष्ट रेंजों के सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (प्रील), उसके स्तम्भ (3) में तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टियों में विनिविष्ट आयकर प्रधिकारी द्वारा आयकर सकिलों में आयकर या प्रतिकर से निर्धारित गेसे सभी अन्य शक्तियों और आयों का बाबत, अपने हारयों का पालन करेंगे।

प्रान्तसूची

क्रम सं०	रेंज	आयकर सकिल और आयकर प्रधिकारी
1	2	3
1.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील), "क" रेंज, मुख्यालय राजकोट	वार्ड-क, राजकोट वार्ड-ज, राजकोट वार्ड-ग, राजकोट वार्ड-घ, राजकोट वार्ड-क, राजकोट वार्ड-च, राजकोट केन्द्रीय सकिल, राजकोट
2.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील), "ब" रेंज, मुख्यालय राजकोट	2. जूलांग उपसंचालक 3. गोरखी सकिल
2.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील), "ब" रेंज, मुख्यालय राजकोट	वार्ड-ल और प्रतिरिक्त-क, राजकोट वार्ड-ज, राजकोट वार्ड-म, राजकोट वार्ड-ट, राजकोट वार्ड-क, राजकोट वार्ड-घ, राजकोट वार्ड-न, राजकोट वार्ड-द, राजकोट वार्ड-प, राजकोट वार्ड-स, राजकोट विशेष सर्वेक्षण सकिल, राजकोट
3.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील) मुख्यालय, जामनगर	2. सहायक आयुक्त, सम्पदा शुल्क, राजकोट सकिल 3. पोरबंदर सकिल
3.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील) मुख्यालय, जामनगर	1. जामनगर सकिल जिसमें एस आई सी भी शामिल है। 2. केन्द्रीय सकिल, जामनगर 3. भुज सकिल
4.	सहायक आयुक्त (प्रील), मुख्यालय, भावनगर	1. भावनगर सकिल 2. अमरेली सकिल

इस प्रधिसूचना की तारीख से ठीक पूर्व लंबित सभी प्रीलें उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह प्रधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, रेंज के सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (प्रील) को जिसकी इस प्रधिसूचना के प्रनुसार उक्त निर्धारिती पर प्रधिकारिता है, प्रतिरित की जाएगी और उस पर कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

यह प्रधिसूचना तारीख 15-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3127 (फा० सं० 261/14/79-प्राईटी जे)]

S.O. 726.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of

1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of the ranges specified in column (2) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to income-tax or Sur-tax in the Income-tax Circles by the Income-tax Officer specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) thereof:—

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Range 1	Income-tax Circles & Income- tax Officer. 2	3
1.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner 'A' Range, H.Q. Rajkot.	1. Ward-A, Rajkot Ward-B, Rajkot Ward-C, Rajkot Ward-D, Rajkot Ward-E, Rajkot Ward-F, Rajkot Central Circle, Rajkot	
2.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner 'B', Range H.Q. Rajkot.	2. Junagadh Circle. 3. Morvi Circle.	
2.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner 'B', Range H.Q. Rajkot.	1. Ward-G & Addl. G Rajkot. Ward-H, Rajkot Ward-I, Rajkot Ward-J, Rajkot Ward-K, Rajkot Ward-L, Rajkot Ward-M, Rajkot Ward-N, Rajkot Ward-P, Rajkot Ward-R, Rajkot Spl. Survey Circle, Rajkot.	
2.	A.C.E.D., Rajkot Circle.	2. A.C.E.D., Rajkot Circle. 3. Porbandar Circle.	
3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, H.Q. Jamnagar.	1. Jamnagar Circle including S.I.C. 2. Central Circle, Jamnagar. 3. Bhuj Circle.	
4.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, H.Q., Bhavnagar.	1. Bhavnagar Circle. 2. Amreli Circle.	

All Appeals in respect of any assessee pending immediately before the date of this Notification shall, from the date of this Notification takes effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range who has jurisdiction over that assessee as per this notification.

This notification shall take effect from 15-1-1980.

[No. 3127 (F. No. 261/14/79-ITJ)]

का० घा० 727.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर थोड़े, आयकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली सभी अन्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और इस बाबत प्रधिसूचना सं० 2948 (फा० सं० 261/9/79-प्राईटी जे), तारीख 21-7-79 का उपान्तरण करते हुए, निदेश देता है कि सीधे प्रान्तसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिविष्ट सकिल रेंज के महायकर आयुक्त (प्रील), उसके स्तम्भ (3) में तत्सम्बन्धी

प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर वार्ड, सकिलों और जिलों में आयकर और घटिकर से निर्धारित ऐसे सभी अक्तियों और आयों की वावत, आयकर से निर्धारित उन सभी अक्तियों और आयों को छोड़कर, जिन पर अधिकारिता आयकर आयुक्त (अधीक), में निर्दित है, अपने कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

प्रायकर सकिल		
क्रम सं.	रेंज	आयकर सकिल, वार्ड और जिले
1	2	3
1.	लखनऊ रेंज, लखनऊ	1. सकिल-1, लखनऊ 2. सकिल-2, लखनऊ 3. लखनऊ, सर्वान, लखनऊ 4. केन्द्रीय सकिल, 1, 2, 3, लखनऊ 5. बेतन सकिल, लखनऊ 6. सम्पदा शुल्क और आयकर सकिल, लखनऊ 7. उप्राय 8. रायबरेली 9. बाराबंकी
2	बरेली रेंज, बरेली	1. बरेली सर्वान 2. नैनीताल 3. हलद्वानी 4. बदायूं 5. दीलीभीन 6. लखीमपुर खेड़ी 7. सीतापुर 8. हरिहोरी 9. शाहजहांपुर 10. केन्द्रीय सकिल, बरेली 11. गन्धार, सकिल-2, मुरादाबाद जिसका मुख्यालय बरेली होगा।
3.	मुरादाबाद रेंज, मुरादाबाद	1. सकिल-1, मुरादाबाद 2. सकिल-2, मुरादाबाद इसमें गन्धार, सकिल-2, मुरादाबाद जिसका मुख्यालय बरेली है, सम्मिलित नहीं है। 3. चन्दौसी 4. काशीपुर 5. अलमोड़ा 6. रामपुर 7. नजीबाबाद 8. बिजनीर 9. सम्मल 10. पिथौरागढ़

जहाँ कोई आयकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस प्रविष्टिना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी प्रथ्ये रेंज को अन्तरित हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस रेंज के, जिसमें वह आयकर सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित हुआ है, महायक आयुक्त (अधीक) के समक्ष इस प्रविष्टिना की तारीख से ठीक पूर्ण लंबित अधीक उस तारीख से जिस नारीख को यह प्रविष्टिना प्रभावी होती है, उस रेंज के, जिसको उक्त सकिल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तरित,

हुआ है, सहायक आयुक्त (अधीक) को अन्तरित की जाएगी और वही उस पर कार्यवाही करेगा।

यह प्रविष्टिना 14-1-1980 से प्रभावी होगी।

[मा० 3128 (फा० मा० 261/9/79-आईटी जे)]

एम० क० भट्टनागर, प्रब० सचिव
केन्द्रीय प्रस्तक कर बार्ड

S.O 727.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in modification of Notification No. 2948 (F. No. 261/9/79-ITJ) dated 21-7-79 in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges functioning in the Lucknow Charge specified in Column 2 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax and Super-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in Column 3 thereof excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax over which the jurisdiction vest in Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals).

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Range	Income-tax Circles, Wards, Districts
		1
1.	Lucknow Range, Lucknow.	1. Circle-I, Lucknow. 2. Circle-II, Lucknow. 3. Lucknow Circle, Lucknow. 4. Central Circles I, II & III, Lucknow. 5. Salary Circle, Lucknow. 6. Estate Duty cum Income-tax Circle, Lucknow. 7. Unnao. 8. Rae Bareilly. 9. Barabanki.
2.	Bareilly Range, Bareilly	1. Bareilly Circle. 2. Nainital. 3. Haldwani. 4. Budau 5. Pilibhit. 6. Lakhimpur Kheri. 7. Sitapur. 8. Hardoi. 9. Shahjahanpur. 10. Central Circle, Bareilly. 11. C-Ward, Circle-II, Moradabad with Headquarters at Bareilly.
3.	Moradabad Range Moradabad.	1. Circle-I, Moradabad. 2. Circle-II, Moradabad excluding C-Ward, Circle-II Moradabad with Headquarters at Bareilly. 3. Chandauli. 4. Kashipur. 5. Almora. 6. Rampur. 7. Najibabad. 8. Bijnor. 9. Sambhal. 10. Pithoragarh.

Whereas the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof, stands transferred by this notification from one Range to

another Range, appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date of this notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 14-1-1980.

[No. 3128 (F. No. 261/9/79-ITJ]

S. K. BHATNAGAR, Under Secy.
Central Board of Direct Taxes

आधिकार अपील अधिकरण

बम्बई, 25 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 728 :—आधिकार अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 252 की उपधारा (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आधिकार अपील अधिकरण के अध्यक्ष प्रदद्वारा अधीनियमित और भी शक्तियों उपायक द्वारा 1-3-1980 से प्रत्यायोजित करते हैं :—

“प्रपते सम्बद्ध अन्तर्गत की सीमा के अन्तर्गत एक न्यायपीठ की प्रगतियों और आवेदनों का भिन्न-भिन्न स्थानों के बारे न्यायपीठ में स्थानान्तरण।”

[सं० एफ० 63 जेडी (एटी)/79]
टी० डी० शुक्ला, अध्यक्ष
आधिकार अपील अधिकरण

INCOME-TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

Bombay, the 25th February, 1980

S.O. 728.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (5) of the Section 252 of the Income-Tax Act, 1961, the President, Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, hereby delegates further powers to the Vice President, as under, with effect from 1-3-1980.

“Transfer of appeals and Applications from one Bench to another at different stations within their respective Zones.”

[No. F. 63-Jd(AT)/79]

T. D. SUGLA, President Income-Tax
Appellate Tribunal

केंद्रीय उत्पाद एवं सीमा शुल्क समाहरण का कार्यालय

बंगलौर, 22 फरवरी, 1980

सीमाशुल्क

संशोधित

का० आ० 729 :—सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 8 की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आर० एन० शुक्ला, सीमा-शुल्क का समाहरण, कनॉटिक समाहरणिय, कर देय वस्तुओं को साझने और उत्पादने और आदि अनाज, अन्य सरकारी माल और नमक को उताने के लिए इस समाहरणिय द्वारा जारी किये गये दिनांक 23 मित्तम्बर, 1968 के अधिनियम की मंलग्न मार्गी में उल्लिखित पुराने मंगलूर बन्दरगाह के छाट नं० 31 (पुराना 33) का प्रत्योक्तव्य करता है।

[रो० ८ चना नं० 1/80/सी० नं० 8/48/40/80/सी० 2/ सीमा शुल्क]

आर० एन० शुक्ला, समाहरण

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Bangalore, the 22nd February, 1980

(CUSTOMS)

AMENDMENT

S.O. 729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Customs Act, 1962, I, R. N. Shukla, Collector of Karnataka Collectorate hereby approve wharf No. 31 (old 33) of the old Mangalore Port specified in the Table appended to the Notification dated 23rd September 1968 issued by this Collectorate for the unloading and loading of dutiable goods and unloading of food grains other Government Cargo and Salt.

[Notification No. 1/80/C. No. VIII/48/40/80 C2/Cus.]

R. N. SHUKLA, Collector

वाणिज्य एवं नागरिक आपूर्ति मंत्रालय

(संयुक्त मूल्य नियंत्रक आवात तथा निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आवेदन

मद्रास, 20 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 730.—सर्वेश्वी गोपाल ईंजिनियरिंग वर्क्स, 88-89, एम० एन० बेट्टी स्ट्रीट, रायपुरम, मद्रास-13 को टिनप्लेट बेस्ट-बेस्ट का आवात करने के लिए 3,04,053 रुपये का आवात नाइसेंस मंलग्न पी-एस-8226539-डी-एस-67-एम 78-05-14 दिनांक 14-6-78 जारी किया गया था। नाइसेंसधारी ने उपर्युक्त नाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रदोजनार्थ प्रति भी अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस्तिए आवेदन किया है कि उनके द्वारा वह खो दी गई है। नाइसेंसधारी से यह भी रिपोर्ट किया गया है कि नाइसेंस को समाहरण, सीमाशुल्क के पास पंजी-कृत किया गया है और उमका अंगत प्रयोग भी किया गया है। नाइसेंस की पूरा मूल्य 3,04,053 रुपये थे और अब आवेदन मूल्य 2,26,273 रुपये के लिए अनुलिपि प्रति भी आवेदन किया गया है।

प्रपते तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधिनियमाकारी इस बात से संतुष्ट है कि नाइसेंस मंलग्न पी-एस-8226539-डी-एस-67-एस-78-05-14 दिनांक 14-6-78 की सीमाशुल्क की मूल प्रति खो दी गयी है और आवेदन को उपर्युक्त नाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रति की अनुलिपि अवशेष मूल्य के लिए जारी किया जाय। नाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क मूल प्रति एन्डवारा रह किया जाता है।

सीमाशुल्क प्रति की अनुलिपि गंभीर डी 2464804 दिनांक 19-2-80 अन्वय जारी किया जा रहा है।

[सं० आई० एण्ड एम०/टी० गी०/एम० डी०/14/78-79/ए०य० 3]

आर० कुमारवेल, उप मूल्य नियंत्रक आवात तथा निर्यात कुनै संयुक्त मूल्य नियंत्रक, आवात तथा निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE & CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Office of the Joint Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

Madras, the 20th February, 1980

S.O. 730.—M/s. Gopal Engineering Works, 88/89, S. N. Chetty Street, Royapuram, Madras-13, were granted licence No. P/S/9226539/C/XX/67/M78/05/14 14-6-78 for import of Tin Plate Waste/Waste to the value of Rs. 3,04,053. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Customs copy of the above licence which has been lost by them. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence has been registered with the Collector of Customs, Madras and utilised partly. The total amount for which the licence was issued is Rs. 3,04,053/- and the total amount for which the duplicate is now required is to cover the balance of Rs. 2,26,273.

2. In support of their contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs Copy of the licence No. P/S/8226539/C/XX/67/M/78 dated 14-6-78 has been directed that a duplicate Customs Copy of the said licence should be issued to them for the balance value. The original Customs Copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Copy of the licence No. D264804 dated 19-2-80 is being issued separately.
[No. I&S/TP/MD/14/78/AU-III]
R. KUMARAVELU, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports and Exports
For Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports

(नागरिक प्रूति विभाग)

भारतीय मानक संस्था

मई दिल्ली, 1980-02-28

का० प्रा० 731.—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुमार प्रधिमूलित किया जाता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में विवरण मन्त्रित विए गए 78 लाइसेंस माह फरवरी 1977 में स्वीकृत किए गए और लाइसेंस धारियों को मानक चिह्न इस्तेमाल करने का अधिकार दिया गया।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या सं० (सीएम/एल)	बैधता की प्रवधि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के प्रधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया और तरसवैधि पत्राम
1 2	3	4	5 6
1. सीएम/एल-5857 1977-02-03	77-02-01	78-01-31 प्रलका हहस्ट्रीज, जयप्रकाश नगर, आलमधारा वांछित रंग का शुष्क हिस्टेपर— पद्धनऊ-226005 (उ०प्र०) उनका कार्यालय: पुरामा किला लखनऊ (उ०प्र०)	IS: 427—1965
2. सीएम/एल-5858 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15 इंडस्ट्रियल मित्रलेस एंड केमिकल्स, बाई संक्षेप टेक्नीको— संक्षा 4, जगमोहनबाबू सराफ मार्ग, मध्यूच कोप्रापरेटिव गिरिंग फैक्ट्री बाम- नगर रै० स्टै० जिला, अमरावती (महाराष्ट्र) इनका कार्यालय: राजधानी, द्राक्षर—धाम- नगर, रै० स्टै० 444709 जिला अमरावती (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 261—1966
3. सीएम/एल-5859 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15 दि मिस्ट्रेलेक्स मिल्स क० लि०, (इकाई सं० 2) गिरिंग गांव समुच्च गिरिंग—गिरपुर रेलवे स्टेशन ग्राकोला-444001 (महाराष्ट्र)	पटे बताने की सूती इक— IS: 5996—1970
4. सीएम/एल-5860 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15 देवीदयाल (सेल्स) प्रा० लि०, 50 ए०जी० प्राई० डॉ० सी० इस्टेट, कालोल-389330 जिला पंचमहल (गुजरात राज्य)	बीएचसी (एचसीएच) जल विसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS: 562—1972
5. सीएम/एल-5861 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15 प्रेसीफेंट इंडस्ट्रीज रोह स० 95/5 चिका इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, भावनगर-364001 (गुजरात राज्य) कार्यालय डाक थैला संक्षा 4, गंगा जलिया ताल भावनगर-364001 (गुजरात)	बीएचसी (एचसीएच) धूलन पाउडर— IS: 561—1972
6. सीएम/एल-5862 1977-02-03	77-01-16	78-01-15 श्री गणेश स्टील रोलिंग मिल, 14-ए, एस्पोर हाईटोड, भद्राम-600019 (तमिलनाडू)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म) -- IS: 226—1975
7. सीएम/एल-5863 1977-02-03	77-01-16	78-01-15 निशुर टेक्सटाइल्स प्रा० लि०, अनुप्रपलयम् निल्पुर	होंडरी का खुदरंग सूती धागा, 60 न० तक कंधा किया हुआ-- IS: 834—1975
8. सीएम/एल-5864 1977-02-03	77-01-16	78-01-15 श्री अरविंद स्टील प्रा० लि०, धुमकुडि संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म) के निश्चिरापली-620015 (तमिलनाडू) इनका कार्यालय—धुमकुडि इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट निल्चि-620015 (तमिलनाडू)	रूप में बेलन के लिए कार्बन इस्पात की मिलिया सूथा इंगट-- IS: 6914—1973
9. सीएम/एल-5865 1977-02-03	77-01-16	78-01-15 ,,	संरचना इस्पात (माधारण किस्म) के रूप में बेलन के लिए कार्बन इस्पात की मिलिया सूथा इंगट-- IS: 6915—1978

1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	सीएम/एल-5866 1977-02-03	77-02-01	78-01-31	भारत ट्रेंचेस्ट इंडस्ट्रीज, 100-ए भद्रपि वाय के पेटियों के धातु फिल्टर— देशन्द्र रोड, कलकत्ता-700006 (पश्चिम बंगाल)	IS : 10--1970
11.	सीएम/एल-5867 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15	शामेहरा स्टील पैड फोर्जिम प्रा० लि० टिम्बर पॉड, कोरकोर रोड, शालीमार, हावड़ा-711103 (पश्चिम बंगाल) कार्यालय : पी-35 इडिया एक्सचेंज लेस कलकत्ता-700001 (पश्चिम बंगाल)	मशीन कार्य के लिए चमकीली इस्पात की छड़े— IS : 4855--1968
12.	सीएम/एल-5868 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15	सन स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, पी-49/1 बनारस रोड, हावड़ा-711105	सरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)-- IS : 1977--1975
13.	सीएम/एल-5869 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15	श्रीरत्न नवरत्न (प्रा०) लि०, 156/बी मानिकलाला मेन रोड, कलकत्ता-700054 (प० बंगाल) कार्यालय : 115 केनिंग स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700001 (प० बंगाल)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)-- IS : 226--1975
14.	सीएम/एल-5870 1977-02-03	77-02-16	78-02-15	"	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)-- IS : 1977--1975
15.	सीएम/एल-5871 1977-02-03	77-02-01	78-01-31	स्वातिंदी स्टील ट्र्यूब्स प्रा० लि०, बिदकी रोड, जिला फतेहपुर (उ०प्र०) कार्यालय - प्रग्राम विलिंग वि माल, कानपुर 208004 (उ०प्र०)	मुद्र इस्पात के ट्यूब, हड्डे मध्यम और भारी 50 मिमी सांकेतिक और वाले— IS : 1239 (भाग 1)--1973
16.	सीएम/एल-5872 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	शाह मेडिकल एंड मजिकल क० लि०, प्राजवा रोड, बडोदरा-390001 (गुजरात)	मरु चिकित्सा स्कालेन के लिए क्षियोज्य छड़े-- IS : 3319--1973
17.	सीएम/एल-5873 1977-03-21	77-02-16	78-02-15	टॉम सिरिज मैग्नीफिचरिंग क०, मीरांगांव, स्वामी विवेकानंद रोड, (धारास्ताधीशा) घम्बई-400068 कार्यालय : 317-12 दादाभाई नोरोंगी रोड, फोटो प्रॉसेसर घम्बई, एनेकसी घम्बई-400001	मध्योत्तर, सिरिज और ट्र्यूब्स्यूलिन 1 मिंटो ममाई वाले-- IS : 3237--1965
18.	सीएम/एल-5874 1977-03-21	77-02-01	78-01-31	एलुमिनियम इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 1 सिरीमिक फैक्टरी रोड, कुडारा-601501 (केरल राज्य)	1100 बोल्ट तक कार्यकारी बोल्टों के लिए एलुमिनियम चालकों वाले पीसीसी रोधिन कंबल भारी हम्बूटी वाले— IS : 1554 (भाग 1)--1964
19.	सीएम/एल-5875 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	गोदावरी ट्रेलिंग कारपोरेशन, नरायणगढ़ रोड, ग्राम्पाला नगर-134007 (हरियाणा)	बालू ढाले लोहा के पाइप 75 मिमी और 100 मिमी साइज वाले— IS : 1729--1964
20.	सीएम/एल-5876 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	ज्वांट प्रोटेक्शन प्रॉडक्श्स प्रा० लि०, कोडवलूर कोवूर तालुक नेल्लोर गिला प्रांध प्रदेश कार्यालय : 4/90-ए नशाखेठ नेल्लोर-524002 (प्रांध प्रदेश)	झाँड़ी वायसीय लेज इव-- IS : 633--1975
21.	सीएम/एल-5877 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	"	मालाधियोन पायमनीय भान्ड-- IS : 2567--1973
22.	सीएम/एल-5878 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	श्री भास्कर एंडो केमिकल पैड कॉटन हैंड-स्ट्रीज, नल्लपाड़, गुडू-522005 (माध्य प्रदेश) कार्यालय : वे राटाना अप्रहार वंगलौर दक्षिण वंगलौर होस्तुर मेन रोड,	वीएचसी (एचसीएल) धूलन पाउडर-- IS : 561--1972
23.	सीएम/एल-5879 1977-02-08	77-02-16	77-02-15	मोता तमीर केमिकल्स, 10वा मील, ताम्र सल्फेट तकनीकी-- वंगलौर--होस्तुर मेन रोड, वे राटाना अप्रहार, वंगलौर दक्षिण वंगलौर होस्तुर मेन रोड,	IS : 261--1966

1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	सीएम/एल-5880 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	श्री विजय बुगा पुलवराइंजिंग मिल्स, सिर- श्रीडीटी पायसनीय सान्द्र-- गुप्ता रोड, आवस्मामावी, बेलारी-583101 IS: 633--1975 (कनॉटक)	
25.	सीएम/एल-5881 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	श्रीनवनान रोलिंग मिल्स, चौथा मोल सेवोक संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)-- रोड, डाकघर--हक्टियासल जिला जलपा- IS: 1977--1975 इंडी (पण्ठम बंगल) कार्यालय : नथ बाजार, निलिंग ही जिला दार्जिनिंग (पण्ठम बंगल)	
26.	सीएम/एल-5882 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	"	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)-- IS: 226--1975
27.	सीएम/एल-5883 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	भारतीय इस्पात उद्योग प्रा. निं, मीठापुर, पटना-800001 (बिहार)	कंकोट प्रबलन के लिए ठंडी मरेडी वित्त इस्पात की सरिया-- IS: 1786--1966
28.	सीएम/एल-5884 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	राठी एलायज एंड स्टील नि०, प्लाट संस्था ए-१ हैट्स्ट्रियल एरिया, जी० टी० रोड के वक्षिण गाजियाबाद (उ०प्र०)	संरचना इस्पात (माधारण किस्म)-- IS: 1977--1975
29.	सीएम/एल-5885 1977-02-11	77-02-16	78-02-15	पंचमहल स्टील नि०, जी० ग्राई० डी० सी० स्टेट, कलोल-382721 जिला पंचमहल (गुजरात)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)-- के रूप में बेलन के लिए कार्बन इस्पात के डलवां बिलेट इंगट-- IS: 6914--1973
30.	सीएम/एल-5886 1977-02-11	77-02-16	78-02-15	पंचमहल स्टील नि०, जी० ग्राई० डी० सी० इंगट, कलोल-382721 जिला पंचमहल (गुजरात)	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म) के रूप में बेलन के लिए कार्बन इस्पात के डलवां बिलेट इंगट-- IS: 6915--1973
31.	सीएम/एल-5887 1977-02-11	77-02-01	78-01-31	नेता मेटल वर्क्स (रजिस्टेड) ०/३ हैट्स्ट्रियल एरिया, जलंधर-144004	जल सेवा के लिए फैब्रल, साइज 15 निमी-- IS: 2692--1964
32.	सीएम/एल-5888 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	मैमसं श्री विजयदुर्गा पुलवराइंजिंग मिल्स, आवस्मामावी सिरगुप्ता रोड, बेलारी- 853101 (कनॉटक)	टॉक्साकीन पायसनीय सान्द्र-- IS: 7946--1976
33.	सीएम/एल-5889 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	गवर्नरमेंट मिल्क स्कीम (देरी विकास विभाग, दूध पाउडर (सेपेरेटा)-- (महाराष्ट्र राज्य), मिरज-416410 जिला माशाली (महाराष्ट्र))	IS: 1165--1975
34.	सीएम/एल-5890 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	वि बैंक नियंत्रित मिल्स, 13, चिकमग्ला बेट्टियार साथी दुनी सूटी विनियान टाइप के स्ट्रीट, तिक्कुर ६३८६०४	साथी दुनी सूटी विनियान टाइप के गोल गले की थांडी थांड रहित (धारएन) वा. गोल गले की छांटी थांड थाली (धार एन एस)-- IS: 4964 (धार 2)--1975
35.	सीएम/एल-5891 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	वैससं श्रीमा रमेश वर्मसे, तिश्वरकाड डाकघर बरास्ता घणाडीपुरम् भलम्पुरम् जिला (केरल) कार्यालय : निकट धर्गटीपुरम् तिश्वरकाड)	धर्मोनिया परिवर्भित प्राकृतिक सान्द्र-- रमेश लैटेक्स-- IS: 5430-1969
36.	सीएम/एल-5892 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	स्टील क्राफ्ट, जी०टी० रोड, पानीपत (हरियाणा)	साइकिल और सम्बद्ध कारों के लिए इस्पात के द्यूप-- IS: 2039-1964
37.	सीएम/एल-5893 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	म्बारिस्टक पेस्टिमाइंडर एंड केमिकल्स प्रोपा र्टी, मुजफ्फरनगर-251001 (उ०प्र०)	डाइमीयोएट पायसनीय सान्द्र-- IS: 3903--1975
38.	सीएम/एल-5894 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	प्रशोक डेवलपमेंट, न्याट सं० १२९ सी०, भरतमेंट इंस्ट्रियल इंस्टेट, कांडील्ली पर्सिम बम्बई-400067 (महाराष्ट्र)	कार्बारिल जल परिवर्धी तेज चूंग-- IS: 7121--1973
39.	सीएम/एल-5895 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	"	कार्बारिल धूसन पाउडर-- IS: 7122--1973
40.	सीएम/एल-5896 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	प्लाट प्रोटेक्शन इंडस्ट्रीज, ई-६, इंस्ट्रियल इंस्टेट, अमरावती रोड, पो० शा० २१८, गुदूर-522002 (ग्राम प्रदेश)	इंडोसल्फान पायसनीय सान्द्र-- IS: 4323--1967

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
41. सी एम/एल-5897 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	जग्नालक्ष्मी फर्टिशाइजर्ज, बैंकटरायपुरम डानुकु. होमस्कॉन पायसनीय सा.इ— 534211 पश्चिम गोदावरी जिला (आ० प्र०)	IS : 4323—1967	
42. सी एम/एल-5898 1977-02-28	76-02-06	77-02-15	महता वेंड्रोकेमिकल्ज, श्री मीनाशी गार्डन्स, किंजाकट्टूले पुराना पल्लवारम डाकघर, मद्रास-601303	पैराफिन मोम डाईप-3 IS : 4654—1974	
43. सी एम/एल-5899 1977-02-28	77-02-01	78-01-31	बजरंगबद्दी आयरन एंड स्टील कॉ. लि०, संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म) — 100-ए ब्रेमिन रोड, तिरुयोत्तियूर, मद्रास-600019 (तमिलनाडू)	IS : 226—1975	
44. सी एम/एल-5900 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	मेसर्स तमिल नाडू एंड्रो इंडस्ट्रीज कारपोरेशन डाकमाफीन पायसनीय सा.इ— लि०, प्लॉट संख्या 18 ए० 112 इंड- स्ट्रियल इस्टेट, प्रम्भातूर, मद्रास-600098 (तमिलनाडू)	IS : 7946—1976	
45. सी एम/एल-5901 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	वी० घार० इंडस्ट्रीज, 50/15 घानंद पर्वत, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, गली नं० 1, न्य० रोहतक रोड, नई विल्ली	अब मीटर, आई डायल टाइप ए 15 मिमी साइज केबल— IS 779—1968	
46. सी एम/एल-5902 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	स्वास्तिक केमिकल्स एंड वेस्टिशाइट्स, हिसार रोड, रोहतक	ओ एच सी (एच सी एच) ब्लून पाउडर— IS : 561—1972	
47. सी एम/एल-5903 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	ए० कॉ० इलेक्ट्रिकल कारपोरेशन, 121ई, प्रोब्ला इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, नई विल्ली-110020	स्कॉटर और मोटर साइकिल चालकों के लिए सुरक्षा हेलमेट— IS : 4115—1968	
48. सी एम/एल-5904 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	मेसर्स आध कारपोरेशन लि०, छाइट फील्ड रोड, कृष्णराजपुरम, बंगलोर-560027	पोशाक कमानियों के मूल रिक्षे इस्पात के तार के उत्पादन के लिए इस्पात की इंगट और सिलिंडर— IS : 8056—1976	
49. सी एम/एल-5905 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	बंगलोर डेरी (कनटिक डेरी विकास निगम निगम लि० की इकाई) होस्तुर रोड, बंगलोर-560029 (कनटिक)	संचालित रूप्त— IS : 1166—1973	
50. सी एम/एल-5906 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	दि होशियासुर ओप्रापरेटिव मिल्क प्रोड्यूसर्स बूनियन लि०, अजगोवल गांव, (डाकघर अदमवल) पौ० बा० संख्या 13, होशियार- पुर-146001 (पंजाब)	सेपेरेटा रूप्त पाउडर— IS : 1165—1975	
51. सी एम/एल-5907 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	दि नेपाल रोलिंग एंड स्टील रोप्स लि०, सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए पूर्व ओव पाठा रोड, शामसगर 24 परगना पश्चिम बंगाल, कार्यालय-एस आई सी सी सी ओ हाऊस, 1 अर 2 हेक्टर स्ट्रीट कसकरा-700001 (पश्चिम बंगाल)	सुहु इस्पात के तार— IS : 280—1972	
52. सी एम/एल-5908 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	चिप्टर (इंडिया) फुकान अस्ती डाकघर, जोरहट जिला सिबसागर-785640 (पश्चम)	चाय की पेटियों के लिए बातु फिटिंग— IS : 10—1970	
53. सी एम/एल-5909 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	प्रनाम स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, इंड- स्ट्रियल एरिया, पाटनचौर जिला, मेडफ (आ० प्र०)	भाषीनीरी पेचों के निर्माण (टोपी बनानेकी शीत विधि द्वारा) के लिए तार लड्डों के उन्पादन के लिए इस्पात के इंगट— IS : 8057—1976	
54. सी एम/एल-5910 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	श्री राम एंड्रो केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, प्रोब्लनयपुरमे जिला गुंटूर (आ० प्र०) कार्यालय : ५३८ लाइन बोडिपेटे, गुंटूर-522002 (आ० प्र०)	होमस्कॉन पायसनीय सा.इ— IS : 4323—1967	
55. सी एम/एल-5911 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	हुषि डिस्क्स प्रा० लि०, सी-१-सी-६ इंड- स्ट्रियल एरिया, परसाबेहा, बरेली (उ० प्र०) कार्यालय : ५० सिविल लाइस बरेली (उ० प्र०)	हुषि जुहाई प्रबतल डिस्क, सादा किनारे बाली— IS : 4366 (भाग १)—1972	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
56. सी एम/एल-5912 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	टेंसाइन स्टील लिं. होराबाग, विश्वामित्र रोड, बड़ोदरा-340001	पूर्व प्रतिक्रिया कंक्रीट के लिए बातेश्वर तार साइज 4 मिमी और 5 मिमी- IS : 6003--1970
57. भी एम/एल-5913 1977-03-21		77-02-16	78-02-15	प्रवीणी नवीनीजी, 398, मुदठीगंज, इलाहा- बाद (उ०प्र०)	मील लगाने की मोम पेंड 1 और 2— IS : 868—1956
58. सी एम/एल-5914 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	प्रीमियर पेंटिमाइक्स प्रा० लि०, प्लाट मंडपा- 76 ए ब्रिक्कारा, इंडस्ट्रियल स्टेट फ्लामामैटी-683104 (केरल) कार्यालय: ई० आर० जी० रोड, एन्टाकुलम कोरीन 68011 (केरल)	भी एच सी (एच सी एच) जल परिषेपी तेज चूर्ण— IS : 562--1972
59. सी एम/एल 5915 1977-02-28		77-02-16	78-02-15	मेससं श्री देवी सौं मिल्स एंड युन इंडस्ट्रीज, चाय की पेटियों की पट्टियाँ— पश्चिम आखकुड़ी-680307 खिंचूर जिला (केरल)	IS : 10 (भाग 3)—1974
60. सी एम/एल-5916 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	स्टील क्रापटज, जी०टी० रोड, पानीपत (हर- याणा)	बिजली की बायरिंग के लिए सहृद इस्पात की तार नलियाँ, 16 मिमी बाह्य व्यास बाशी— IS : 1653—1972
61. सी एम/एल-5917 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	कृष्ण इलेक्ट्रिक्स हॉल्डरीज, मार्डिल चम्पी, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, सीशीपुरा, नई रिस्ली-110005	पी बी सी रोधित और पी बी सी बोल बाले केबल, एलुमिनियम चालक, एक कोर बाले, केबल 250/440 बोल्ट— IS : 694 (भाग 2)—1964
62. सी एम/एल-5918 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	इलेक्ट्रिट इंटरप्राइजेज, 1 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जोटवाडा, अम्पुर (राजस्थान)	18 लिटर बाले बर्गाकार टिन— IS : 916—1975
63. सी एम/एल-5919 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	कूवर्जी देवेणी एंड क० प्रा० लि०, गोवंडी वर्सन निकट गोवंडी रेलवे स्टेशन, गोवंड देवतेर, बम्बई-400088 कार्यालय— 105/106 प्ररुण चैम्बर्ज, द्रेट, बम्बई- 400034	बम्बल के लिए ट्रेसर पथ्य साइज 680 लि/मिनट और 1800 लि/मिनट— IS : 943-1966 और IS : 944— 1966
64. सी एम/एल-5920 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	घरोंक ट्रेडर्ज, 129-सी गवर्नमेंट इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, कांडीविली पश्चिम बम्बई-400067 (महाराष्ट्र)	शी डी टी जल विसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS : 565—1975
65. सी एम/एल-5921 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	आपरेन फाउंडेशन पंड फैब्रिकेट्स (इंडिया) प्रा० लि०, 24 बेलूर रोड, लिंगाम, हावड़ा कार्यालय-7 बोर्ड कोट हाउस कार्नर, कलकत्ता-700001	किना लेप किए बालू छले लोहे के मल पाइप भी रुटकल कालर, 0.4/ कि० प्रा० बल/सेमी, इवस्ट्रीटिक, दाढ़ बाले 100 मिमी सांकेतिक साइज के— IS : 1729—1964
66. सी एम/एल-5922 1977-02-28		77-03-01	78-02-28	एम० सी० मावजी एंड क० प्रा० लि०, 118, दालीगंज सर्कुलर रोड, कलकत्ता-700053	मूरु इस्पात के टी कब्जे (मध्यम टाइप 2) 75 से 300 मिमी साइज— मूरु इस्पात के पालियामेंट कब्जे, टाइप 2, 3.50 से 200 मिमी साइज, (मूरु इस्पात के टक्करद्वार कब्जा, भारी बजन वाले, 50 से 100 मिमी साइज मध्यम बजन वाले— 50 से 300 मिमी साइज मध्यम बजन वाले, 40 से 150 मिमी साइज, कूलके बजन वाले, 40 से 100 मिमी साइज,— IS : 206—1973, IS : 362— 1975 और IS : 1341—1970
67. सी एम/एल-5923 1977-02-28		77-01-01	77-12-31	राजश्री इंटरप्राइजेज, बैंडल स्टेशन रोड, (जी०टी० रोड, अंभेशन जिला हृशीली, पश्चिम बंगाल) कार्यालय 21ए, बिप्लबी रास यिहारी बम्बु रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	पैराफिर मोम टाइप 3— IS : 4654—1974

1	2	3	4	5	6
68.	सी एम/एल-5924 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	बम्बई भुड़ग प्रा० लि०, ए-२ यूनिट, इंडस्ट्री यल हस्टेट, विशाखापत्नम-530007 कार्यालय : ४८-९-६ को-ओपरेटिव कालोनी, विशाखापत्नम	प्रवित पेट्रोलियम गैस से चलने वाले धरेलू गैस स्टोर-- IS : 4246—1972
69.	सी एम/एल-5925 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	जयलक्ष्मी फॉटोलाइसेज, वैंकटरामगुरुम, टानुकु 534211 परिचमी गोदावरी जिला (आंध्र प्रदेश)	डी ई टी पायमनीय मान्द-- IS : 633—1975
70.	सी एम/एल-5926 1977-02-28	77-03-21	78-02-28	कान्वामी रीम एप्लायेज कं० प्रा० लि०, ८- मी०, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, अमौली, कानपुर शेह, लखनऊ-226001 (उप्र०)	प्रवित पेट्रोलियम गैस से चलने वाले धरेलू गैस स्टोर-- IS : 4246—1972
71.	सी एम/एल-5927 1977-02-28	77-03-21	78-02-28	फार्मिको प्रा० लि०, २१-३३, जी० आई० बी० सी० इस्टेट, श्रीमतनगर -383001, जिला सबरकोठा (गुजरात) कार्यालय : ९८०, खाड़ाला गोलवाड़ नाका, ग्रहमदावाद- ३८०००१ (गुजरात)	डी ई धूलत पाउडर-- IS : 564—1975
72.	सी एम/एल-5928 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	दावाजी दाकवी कं० प्रा० लि०, कोल तार के आच रंगों की निर्मितियाँ ३६७-गुरुजी भारी, आरीपाड़ा पुलिस ब्लॉ- टरों के पीछे, बम्बई-400011 (महाराष्ट्र) कार्यालय-२७४ सैमुपल स्ट्रीट बुडगाड़ी बम्बई-400003 (महाराष्ट्र)	प्रोर मिथण-- IS : 5346—1975
73.	सी एम/एल-5929 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	एस एम पी प्रा० लि०, सुभाष नगर, गुभाय रोड, जोगेश्वरी (पुर्व) बम्बई-400060 (महाराष्ट्र)	एलिङ्ग पायमनीय मान्द-- IS : 1307—1973
74.	सी एम/एल-5930 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	जलगांव जिला सहकारी दूध विकास केन्द्रेशन लि०, जलगांव ढेरी, प०० बा० मंड्या ३२ जलगांव-425001 (महाराष्ट्र)	दूध का पाउडर (सेपेरेटा)-- IS : 1165—1975
75.	सी एम/एल-5931 1977-02-28	77-01-16	78-01-15	वि इंडियन रेयन कारपोरेशन लि०, (यूनिट, जयश्री टेक्सटाइल्ज एंड इंडस्ट्रीज) रिवरा, जिला हुगली-७१२१०३ (पश्चिम बंगाल)	आग बुझाने के लिए बिना प्रस्तर वाला सन फैब्रिक साइज 63 मिमी और 70 मिमी-- IS : 4927—1968
76.	सी एम/एल-5932 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	वि इंडियन रेयैन कारपोरेशन लि०, (यूनिट— जयश्री टेक्सटाइल्ज एंड इंडस्ट्रीज) रिवरा, जिला हुगली (पश्चिमी बंगाल)	किलयरर कपड़ा-- IS : 7610 (भाग 2)—1975
77.	सी एम/एल-5933 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	वि इंडियान रेयैन कारपोरेशन लि०, (यूनिट— जयश्री टेक्सटाइल्ज एंड इंडस्ट्रीज) रिवरा जिला हुगली (पश्चिमी बंगाल)	मौड देने का फ्लार्बेन-- IS : 7610 (भाग 3)—1975
78.	सी एम/एल-5934 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	वै-मायल रिफाइनरीज, डी-८८ से डी-९३ इंड- स्ट्रीयल इस्टेट, भजोगड़ (उप्र०)	पैगफिल मोम टाइप ३— IS : 4654—1975

[मं० सी एम डी/13 : 11]

(Department of Civil Supplies)
INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION
New Delhi, the 1980-02-28

S. O. 731.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that seventy eight licences, particulars of which are given in the following schedule, have been granted during the month of February 1977 authorizing the licensees to use the Standard Marks :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. (CM/L)	Period of Validity From (2)	To (3)	Name and Address of the Licensee (5)	Article/Process Covered by the Licences and the Relevant IS : Designation (6)
1.	CM/L-5857 1977-02-03	77-02-01	78-01-31	Alka Industries, Jaiprakash Nagar, Alam- bagh, Lucknow-226005 (U.P.) having their office at Purana Kila, Lucknow (U.P.)	Distemp, dry, colour as required— IS : 427-1975

1	2	3	4	5	6
2. CM/L-5858 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Industrial Minerals & Chemicals, Ward No. 4, Jagmohanbabu Saraf Marg, Opp : Co-operative Ginning Factory, Dhamnagar R. S. Distt. Amravati (Maharashtra) having their office at Raj Bhavan, P.O. Dhamnagar, R.S. 444709-Distt. Amravati (Maharashtra).	Copper sulphate, technical— IS : 261-1966
3. CM/L-5859 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	The Simplex Mills Co. Ltd., (Unit No. 2) Shivni Village ,Opp. Shivni-Shirpur Rly. Station Akola-444001 (Maharashtra).	Cotton belting : ducks— IS : 5996-1970
4. CM/L-5860 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Devidayal (Sales) Pvt. Ltd., of 50-A, G.I. D.C. Estate, Kalol-389330, Distt. Panchmahals (Gujarat State).	BHC (HCH) water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 562-1972
5. CM/L-5861 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	President Industries, of Shed No. 95/5, Chitra Industrial Estate, Bhavnagar-364001 (Gujarat State) having their office at Post Bag No. 4, Ganga Jalia Talas, Bhavnagar-364001 (Gujarat).	BHC (HCH) dusting powders— IS : 561-1972
6. CM/L-5862 1977-02-03		77-01-16	78-01-15	Shree Ganesh Steel Rolling Mill, 14-A, Ennore High Road, Madras-600019 (Tamil Nadu).	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1975
7. CM/L-5863 1977-02-03		77-01-16	78-01-15	Tirupur Textiles Pvt. I.d., Annupparpalam, Tirupur	Grey cotton yarn for hosiery upto and including 60s combed— IS : 834-1975
8. CM/L-5864 1977-02-03		77-01-16	78-01-15	Sree Aravindh Steel Pvt. Ltd., Thuvakudy Tiruchirapalli-620015 (Tamil Nadu) having their office at D-38 Thuvakudy Industrial Estate, Trichy-620015 (Tamil Nadu).	Carbon steel cast billet ingots for rolling into structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 6914-1973
9. CM/L-5865 1977-02-03		77-01-16	78-01-15	-do-	Carbon steel cast billet ingots for rolling into structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 6915-1973
10. CM/L-5866 1977-02-03		77-02-01	78-01-31	Bharat Teachest Industries, 100-A Maharshi Debendra Road, Calcutta-700006 (West Bengal).	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970
11. CM/L-5867 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Damehra Steel & Forgings Pvt. Ltd., Timber Pond, Foreshore Road, Shalimar, Howrah-711103 (W. Bengal) having their office at P-35 India Exchange Place, Calcutta-700001 (W. Bengal).	Bright steel bars for machining— IS : 4855-1968
12. CM/L-5868 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Sun Steel Industries, P-49/1, Benaras Road, Howrah-711105.	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1975
13. CM/L-5869 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Shreeratan Navratna (P) Ltd., 156/B, Maniktala, Main Road, Calcutta-700054 (W. Bengal) having their office at 115 Canning Street, Calcutta-700001 (W. Bengal).	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1975
14. CM/L-5870 1977-02-03		77-02-16	78-02-15	Shreeratan Navratna (P) Ltd., 156/B, Maniktala, Main Road, Calcutta-700054, (W. Bengal) having their office at 115 Canning Street, Calcutta-700001 (W. Bengal).	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1975
15. CM/L-5871 1977-02-03		77-02-01	78-01-31	Quality Steel Tubes Pvt. Ltd., Bindki Road, Distt. Fatehpur (U.P.) having their office at Agarwala Building, The Mall, Kanpur-208004 (U.P.).	Mild steel tubes, light, medium and heavy upto 50 mm nominal bore— IS : 1239 (Pt 1)--1973
16. CM/L-5872 1977-02-08		77-02-01	78-01-31	Shah Medical & Surgical Co. Ltd., Ajwa Road, Baroda-390001 (Gujarat).	Detachable blades for surgical scalpels— IS : 3319-1973
17. CM/L-5873 1977-03-21		77-02-16	78-02-15	Tob Syringe Manufacturing Co., Mira Village Swami Vivekanand Road, Via Dahisar, Bombay-400068 having their office at 317-12 Dadabhai Naoroji Road, Fort, Prospect Chambers, Annex, Bombay-400001.	Hypodermic syringes and tuberculin 1 ml. capacity— IS : 3237-1965

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
18. CM/L-5874 1977-03-21	77-02-01	78-01-31	Aluminium Industries Ltd., 1, Ceramic Factory Road, Kundara-691501 (Kerala State).	PVC insulated (heavy duty) cables with aluminium conductors for working voltages upto and including 1100 volts— IS : 1554 (Pt I)—1964	
19. CM/L-5875 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	Godawri Trading Corporation, Naraingarh Road, Ambala City-134007 (Haryana).	Sand cast iron pipes, 75 mm and 100 mm sizes only— IS : 1729-1964	
20. CM/L-5876 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	Plant Protection Products Pvt. Ltd., of Kodavallur Kovur Taluk, District Nellore (Andhra Pradesh) having their office at 4/90-A, Nawabpet, Nellore-524002 (A.P.)	DDT emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 633-1975	
21. CM/L-5877 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	-do-	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1973	
22. CM/L-5878 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	Sri Bhaskara Agro Chemical & Cotton Industries., of Nallapadu, Guntur-522005 (Andhra Pradesh).	BHC (HCH) dusting powders— IS : 561-1972	
23. CM/L-5879 1977-02-08	77-02-16	78-02-15	Sona Thamira Chemicals, 10th Mile, Bangalore-Hosur Main Road, Beratana Agrahara, Bangalore South (Karnataka) having their office at Beratana Agrahara, Bangalore South on the Bangalore Hosur Main Road.	Copper sulphate, technical— IS : 261-1966.	
24. CM/L-5880 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	Sri Vijayadurga Pulverising Mills of Sirguppa Road, Ayammabhavi, Bellary-583101 (Karnataka).	DDT emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 633-1975	
25. CM/L-5881 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	Hindusthan Rolling Mills, 4th Mile Sevoke Road, P.O. Ektiasal, Dist. Jalpaiguri (West Bengal) having their office at Naya Bazar, Siliguri, Dist. Darjeeling (West Bengal).	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1975	
26. CM/L-5882 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	-do-	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1975	
27. CM/L-5883 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	Bhartiya Ispat Udyog Pvt. Ltd., Mithapur, Patna-800001 (Bihar).	Cold twisted deformed steel bars for concrete reinforcement— IS : 1786-1966	
28. CM/L-5884 1977-02-08	77-02-01	78-01-31	Rathi Alloys & Steel Ltd., Plot No. A-1, Industrial Area, South of G.T. Road, Ghaziabad (U.P.)	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1975	
29. CM/L-5885 1977-02-11	77-02-16	78-02-15	Panchmahal Steel Ltd., G.I.D.C. Estate, Kalol-382721, Dist. Panchmahal (Gujarat).	Carbon steel cast billet ingots for rolling into structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 6914-1973	
30. CM/L-5886 1977-02-11	77-02-16	78-02-15	-do-	Carbon steel cast billet ingots for rolling into structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 6915-1973	
31. CM/L-5887 1977-02-11	77-02-01	78-01-31	Neta Metal Works (Regd) 0/3, Industrial Area, Jullundur-144004.	Ferrules for water services size 15 mm— IS : 2692-1964	
32. CM/L-5888 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	M/s Shri Vijayadurga Pulverising Mills, Avamonabhavi, Siruguppa Road, Bellary-583101 (Karnataka).	Toxaphene emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 7946-1976	
33. CM/L-5889 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Government Milk Scheme (Dairy Development Department, Govt of Maharashtra), Miraj-416410, Distt. Sangli (Maharashtra).	Milk powder (skim)— IS : 1165-1975	
34. CM/L-5890 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	The Rank Knitting Mills, 13, Chickkanna Chettiar Street, Tirupur-638604.	Plain knitted cotton vests types : (a) round-neck sleeveless (RN) (b) Roundneck short sleeves (RNS)— IS : 4964 (Pt II)—1975	
35. CM/L-5891 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	M/s Beena Rubber Works, Thirurkad P.O. Via : Angadipuram, Malappuram District (Kerala) (Office at Thirurkad near Angadipuram).	Ammonia presuryed concentrated natural rubber latex— IS : 5430-1969	
36. CM/L-5892 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Steel Krafts, G.T. Road, Panipat (Haryana)	Steel tubes for bicycle and allied purposes— IS : 2039-1964	
37. CM/L-5893 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Swastik Pesticides & Chemicals, Bhopa Road, Muzafdar Nagar-251001 (U.P.)	Dimethoatoe emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 3903-1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
38. CM/L-5894 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Ashok Traders, Plot No. 129-C, Government Industrial Estate, Kandivili West, Bombay-400067 (Maharashtra).	Carbaryl water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 7121-1973	Carbaryl water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 7121-1973
39. CM/L-5895 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	-do-	Carbaryl dusting powders— IS : 7122-1973	Carbaryl dusting powders— IS : 7122-1973
40. CM/L-5896 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Plant Protection Industries, E-6, Industrial Estate Amaravathi Road, Post Box No. 218, Guntur-522002 (A.P.).	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967
41. CM/L-5897 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, Venkatarayapuram, Tanuku-534211, West Godavari Distt. (A.P.)	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967
42. CM/L-5898 1977-02-28	76-12-16	77-12-15	Mahatha Petrochemicals, Shree Meenakshi Gardens, Kizhakkattalai, Old Pallavaram Post, Madras-601303	Paraffin wax type—3 IS : 4654-1974	Paraffin wax type—3 IS : 4654-1974
43. CM/L-5899 1977-02-28	77-02-01	78-01-31	Bajrangbali Iron & Steel Co. Ltd, 100-A Basin Road, Tiruvottiyur, Madras-600019 (Tamil Nadu).	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1975	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1975
44. CM/L-5900 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	M/s. Tamilnadu Agro Industries Corp. Ltd., Plot No. 18 & 112, Industrial Estate, Ambattur, Madras 600098 (Tamil Nadu)	Toxaphene emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 7946-1976	Toxaphene emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 7946-1976
45. CM/L-5901 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	V. R. Industries, 50/16 Anand Parbat, Industrial Estate, Gali No. 1, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi	Water meters, wet dial, type A 15 mm size only— IS : 779-1968	Water meters, wet dial, type A 15 mm size only— IS : 779-1968
46. CM/L-5902 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Swastik Chemicals & Pesticides, Hissar Road, Rohtak.	BHC (HCH) dusting powders— IS : 561-1972	BHC (HCH) dusting powders— IS : 561-1972
47. CM/L-5903 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	A. Z. Electrical Corporation, 121-E, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110020	Protective helmets for scooter and motor cycle riders— IS : 4151-1968	Protective helmets for scooter and motor cycle riders— IS : 4151-1968
48. CM/L-5904 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	M/s. Andhra Steel Corporation Ltd., Whitefield Road, Krishnaraja Puram, Bangalore-560027.	Steel ingots & billets for the production of hard drawn steel wire for up-holstery springs— IS : 8056-1976	Steel ingots & billets for the production of hard drawn steel wire for up-holstery springs— IS : 8056-1976
49. CM/L-5905 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Bangalore Dairy, (Unit of Karnataka Dairy Development Corporation Ltd), or Hosur Road, Bangalore-560029 (Karnataka)	Condensed milk— IS : 1166-1973	Condensed milk— IS : 1166-1973
50. CM/L-5906 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	The Hoshiarpur Co-operative Milk Producers Union Ltd., Village Ajioval, (P. O. Adamwal), Post Box No. 13, Hoshiarpur-146001 (Punjab)	Skim Milk powder— IS : 1165-1975	Skim Milk powder— IS : 1165-1975
51. CM/L-5907 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	The National Rolling & Steel Ropes Ltd., East Ghosh Para Road, Shamaragar, 24 Paiganas, West Bengal, Office at NICCO House, 1 & 2, Hare Street, Calcutta-700001 (W.B.)	Mild steel wire for general engineering purposes— IS : 280-1972	Mild steel wire for general engineering purposes— IS : 280-1972
52. CM/L-5908 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Victor (India) Phukan Ali P. O. Jothat, Distt. Sivasagar-785640 (Assam)	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970
53. CM/L-5909 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Pratap Steel Rolling Mills Pvt. Ltd., Industrial Area, Patancheru, Distt. Medak (A.P.)	Steel ingots for the production of wire rod for the manufacture of machine screws (By cold heading process)— IS : 8057-1976	Steel ingots for the production of wire rod for the manufacture of machine screws (By cold heading process)— IS : 8057-1976
54. CM/L-5910 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Sri Ram Agro Chemical Industries of Obulnaidupalem, Distt. Guntur (Andhra Pradesh) (having office at 5th Line, Brodipet, Guntur-522002) (A.P.)	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967	Endosulfan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967
55. CM/L-5911 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	Krishi Discs Pvt. Ltd., C -1-C 6 Industrial Area Persakhera, Bareilly (U. P.) (having office at 50, Civil Lines, Bareilly) (U. P.)	Agricultural tillage concave disc plain edge— IS : 4366 (Pt I)-1972	Agricultural tillage concave disc plain edge— IS : 4366 (Pt I)-1972
56. CM/L-5912 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Tensile Steel Ltd., Hirabaug, Vishwamitri Road, Baroda-390001 (Gujarat)	Indented wires for prestressed concrete sizes 4 mm and 5 mm— IS : 6003-1970	Indented wires for prestressed concrete sizes 4 mm and 5 mm— IS : 6003-1970

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
57. CM/L-5913 1977-03-21	77-02-16	78-02-15	Praveenjee Naveen jee, 398, Muthiganj, Allahabad (U.P.).	Sealing Wax, Grade 1 & 2— IS : 868-1956	
58. CM/L-5914 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Premier Pesticides Private Limited, Plot No. 76-A Thrikkakara, Industrial Es- tate, Kalamassery-683104 (Kerala) Office at E. R. G. Road, Ernakulam, Cochin- 682011 (Kerala)	BHC (HCH) water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 562-1972	
59. CM/L-5915 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	M/s. Sree Devi Saw Mills & Wooden In- dustries, West Chalakudi-680307 Ti- chur District. (Kerala).	Tea-chest battens— IS : 10 (Pt. III)-1974	
60. CM/L-5916 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Steel Krafts, G. T. Road, Panipat (Haryana)	Rigid steel conduits for electrical wiring, 16 mm outer dia— IS : 1653-1972	
61. CM/L-5917 1977-02-28	77-03-01	178-02-28	Krishna Electrical Industries, Model Basti, Industrial Area, Shidipure, New Delhi- 110005.	PVC insulated and PVC sheathed cables, aluminium conductor, single core, 250/ 440 volts only— IS : 694 (Pt II)-1964	
62. CM/L-5918 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Cement Enterprises, I, Industrial Area, Jhotwara, Jaipur (Raj.).	18-litre square tins— IS : 916-1975	
63. CM/L-5919 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Kooverji Devshi & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Govandi Works Near Govandi Railway Station, Govand (Deoner), Bombay-400088 (office at 105/106, Chambers, Trade, Bombay- 400034).	Trailer pumps for fire brigade use size 680-1/mins 1800-1/Min— IS : 943-1966 & IS : 944-1966	
64. CM/L-5920 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Ashok Traders, 129-C, Government In- dustrial Estate, Kandivili West, Bombay- 400067 (Maharashtra).	DDT water dispersible powder concen- trates— IS : 565-1975	
65. CM/L-5921 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Iron Founders & Fabricators (India) Pri- vate Ltd., 24, Belur Road, Liluah, How- rah (office at 7 Old Court House Corner, Calcutta-700001).	Sand cast iron straight soil pipes and loose collars, uncoated for hydrostatic pres- sure of 0.4 kgf/cm ² upto an includ- ing 100 mm nominal sizes— IS : 1729-1964	
66. CM/L-5922 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	M. C. Mowjee & Co. Pvt. Ltd., 118, Tolly- gunga Circular Road, Calcutta-8700053.	Mild steel tea hinges (medium) tyre 75 to 300 mm sizes. Mild steel parliament hinges type 3.50 to 200 mm sizes, Steel mild but hinges heavy weight type, 50 to 100 mm sizes, medium weight type, 40 to 150 mm sizes, light weight type, 40 to 100 mm sizes— IS : 206-1973, IS : 362-1975 and IS : 1341-1970	
67. CM/L-5923 1977-02-28	77-01-01	77-12-31	Raj shri Enterprises Bandel Station Road, (JN of G. T. Road, Distt. Hooghly, (W. Bengal) (office at 21-A, Biplobi Rashbehari Basu Road, Calcutta-700001).	Paraffin wax type 3— IS : 4654-1974	
68. CM/L-5924 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Bombay Foods Pvt. Ltd., A-2 Unit, In- dustrial Estate, Visakhapatnam-530007 (office at 48-9-6, Co-operative Colony, Visakhapatnam).	Domestic gas stoves use with liquified pet- roleum gases— IS : 4246-1972	
69. CM/L-5925 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, Venkatarayapuram, Tanuku-534211 West Godavari Dis- trict, (Andhra Pradesh).	DDT emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 633-1975	
70. CM/L-5926 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Kalsi Gas Appliances Co. Pvt. Ltd., 8-C, Industrial Area, Amousi Kanpur Road, Lucknow-226001 (U.P.)	Domestic gas stove for use with liquified petroleum gases— IS : 4246-1972	
71. CM/L-5927 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Farmico Pvt. Ltd., 21-23, G.I.D.C. Estate, Himatnagar-383001, Distt. Sabarkantha (Gujarat) (office at 980, Khadla Golwad Naka, Ahmedabad-(380001) (Gujarat).	DDT dusting powders— IS : 564-1975	
72. CM/L-5928 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Dadajee Dhackjee & Co. Pvt. Ltd., 367- Guruji Marg, Behind Aaripade Police Quarters, Bombay-400011 (Maharashtra) (office at 274, Samuel Street, Vudgadi, Bombay-400003) (Maharashtra). (6)	Coal tar food colour preparations and mixtures— IS : 5346-1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
73. CM/L-5929 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	SMP Private Ltd., Subhash Nagar, Subhash Road, Jageshwari (East) Bombay-400060 (Maharashtra).	Aldrin emulsifiable concentrate—	IS : 1307-1973
74. CM/L-5930 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	Jalgaon Jilha Sahakari Dugh Vikas Federation Ltd., Jalgaon Dairy, Post Box No. 32, Jalgaon-42500-1 (Maharashtra).	Skim milk powder—	IS : 1965-1975
75. CM/L-5931 1977-02-28	77-01-16	78-01-15	The Indian Rayon Corp. Ltd., (Unit Jayashree Textiles & Industries) (Rishra Distt, Hooghly-712103 (West Bengal).	Unlined flax canvas for fire fighting size 63 mm & 70 mm—	IS : 4927-1968
76. CM/L-5932 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	The Indian Rayon Corporation Ltd., (Unit-Jayashree Textiles & Industries) Rishra, Distt, Hooghly (W. Bengal).	Cleated cloth—	IS : 7610-(Pt II)-1975
77. CM/L-5933 1977-02-28	77-02-16	78-02-15	The Indian Rayon Corporation Ltd., (Unit-Jayashree Textile & Industries) Rishra, Distt, Hooghly (West Bengal).	Sizing flannel—	IS : 7610 (Pt III)-1975
78. CM/L-5934 1977-02-28	77-03-01	78-02-28	De-Oil Refineries, D-88 to D-93 Industrial Estate, Aligarh (U.P.).	Paraffin wax type 3—	IS : 4654-1974

[No. CMD/13/11]

कांगड़ा 732.—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपचिनियम (1) के प्रत्युत्तर भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि किंतु 280 लाइसेंसों के ब्यौदे नीचे ग्रन्तसूची में दिए गए हैं, उनका अक्टूबर 1979 में नवीकरण किया गया है।

ग्रन्तसूची

वैध

क्रम संख्या	सी.एस/एस संख्या से	भारतीय मानक तक विशिष्टि की पद संख्या	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	24	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 21—1975			
2.	175	79-07-16	80-06-30	IS : 220—1972			
				IS : 1581—1975			
3.	176	79-07-16	80-06-30	IS : 1221—1971			
4.	195	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 303—1975			
5.	348	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 916—1966			
6.	430	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975			
7.	432	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 694—1977			
8.	588	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 694 (भाग 1 भौंग 2)—1964			
9.	610	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 694 (भाग 1 भौंग 2)—1964			
10.	622	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1653—1972			
11.	633	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 277—1969			
12.	634	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1029—1970			
13.	635	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975			
14.	636	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2062—1969			
15.	701	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1675—1971			
16.	765	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975			
17.	776	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 419—1967			
18.	782	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1785 (भाग 1)—1966			
				IS : 1785 (भाग 2)—1967			
19.	792	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 398—1976			
20.	793	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975			
21.	1041	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1875—1971			

1	2	3	4	5
22.	1042	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2830—1975
23.	1043	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2831—1975
24.	1125	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1855—1977
				IS : 1856—1977
25.	1126	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2266—1977
				IS : 2581—1977
26.	1146	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 226—1975
27.	1147	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1977—1975
28.	1150	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1554 (भाग 1)—1964
29.	1216	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1875—1978
30.	1277	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975
31.	1276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
32.	1307	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2645—1975
33.	1317	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 3975—1967
34.	1338	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 692—1973
35.	1340	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3196—1974
36.	1462	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1856—1970
37.	1490	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 266—1977
38.	1515	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 779—1978
39.	1517	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972
40.	1531	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 10 (भाग 4)—1976
41.	1674	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 3899—1966
42.	1683	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 916—1975
43.	1810	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2266—1970
44.	1814	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 21—1975
45.	1831	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
46.	1841	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 562—1972
47.	1905	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3564—1975
48.	1954	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 158—1968
49.	2026	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 6175—1971
				IS : 7821—1975
50.	2043	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561—1972
51.	2069	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 280—1972
52.	2073	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 325—1970
53.	2093	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
54.	2094	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)					
55.	2104	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4) — 1976	100.	3681	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633 — 1956
56.	2110	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 245 — 1970	101.	3742	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5852 — 1970
57.	2117	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4) — 1976	102.	3786	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3564 — 1970
58.	2119	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1786 — 1964	103.	3820	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 1786 — 1966
59.	2127	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 5100 — 1969	104.	3872	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4) — 1976
				IS : 5101 — 1969	105.	3891	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 285 — 1974
				IS : 5102 — 1969	106.	3911	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2596 — 1964
				IS : 5103 — 1963	107.	3942	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 226 — 1975
60.	2186	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 10 (भाग 3) — 1974	108.	3959	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1596 — 1977
61.	2262	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3236 — 1965	109.	3960	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561 — 1972
62.	2276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 632 — 1972	110.	4010	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 560 — 1969
63.	2282	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567 — 1973	111.	4024	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2925 — 1975
64.	2294	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2480 — 1973	112.	4110	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7186 — 1973
65.	2386	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 323 — 1959	113.	4282	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914 — 1973
66.	2404	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1221 — 1971	114.	4283	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6915 — 1973
67.	2455	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 694 — 1977	115.	4301	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 204 — 1974
68.	2457	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 226 — 1975	116.	4420	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786 — 1966
69.	2458	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 1977 — 1975	117.	4445	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 325 — 1970
70.	2662	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 4450 — 1967	118.	4482	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 336 — 1972
71.	2664	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 381 — 1976	119.	4491	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (भाग 2) — 1976
72.	2735	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1554 (भाग 1) — 1976	120.	4498	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2834 — 1964
73.	2754	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1783 — 1974	121.	4508	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 8057 — 1974
74.	2777	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2566 — 1965	122.	4520	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5277 — 1969
				IS : 1943 — 1964	123.	4550	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 226 — 1975
75.	2787	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3035 (भाग 1 और 2) — 1965	124.	4604	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 261 — 1966
76.	2910	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1786 — 1966	125.	4613	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 565 — 1961
77.	2999	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 779 — 1968	126.	4614	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3903 — 1966
78.	3042	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 2) — 1976	127.	4616	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561 — 1972
79.	3077	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2509 — 1973	128.	4618	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 565 — 1975
80.	3117	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 21 — 1975	129.	4623	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2867 — 1964
81.	3146	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 916 — 1975	130.	4627	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4985 — 1968
82.	3168	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601 — 1960	131.	4644	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2552 — 1970
83.	3171	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1943 — 1964	132.	4648	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325 — 1970
				IS : 2566 — 1965	133.	4649	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398 — 1976
84.	3181	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 398 — 1976	134.	4656	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561 — 1972
85.	3190	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1601 — 1960	135.	4668	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914 — 1978
86.	3387	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6240 — 1976	136.	4669	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915 — 1978
87.	3424	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2594 — 1977	137.	4683	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561 — 1972
88.	3491	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6003 — 1970	138.	4686	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 664 — 1975
89.	3514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567 — 1973	139.	4695	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4151 — 1976
90.	3541	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4985 — 1968	140.	4699	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
91.	3544	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1660 (भाग 4) — 1975	141.	4700	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
				IS : 1660 (भाग 4) — 1975	142.	4701	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
92.	3557	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1703 — 1968	143.	4705	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
93.	3562	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2509 — 1973	144.	4706	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
94.	3576	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 226 — 1975	145.	4707	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
95.	3577	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1977 — 1975	146.	4708	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
96.	3583	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 4985 — 1968	147.	4713	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
97.	3602	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1601 — 1960	148.	4715	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848 — 1971
98.	3606	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 6914 — 1973	149.	4717	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 694 (भाग 1) — 1977
99.	3607	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915 — 1973	150.	4722	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1601 — 1960

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
151.	4725	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1601—1960	200.	5844	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 632—1972
152.	4733	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1520—1972 IS : 325—1970	201.	5845	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 633—1975
153.	4734	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4246—1972	202.	5846	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1307—1973
154.	4745	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1925—1974	203.	5848	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2567—1973
155.	4755	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 561—1972	204.	5849	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2682—1966
156.	4756	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 564—1975	205.	5850	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2861—1964
157.	4782	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561—1972	206.	5851	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4323—1967
158.	4783	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 5346—1975	207.	5852	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5277—1969
159.	4790	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 7409—1974	208.	5853	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5281—1969
160.	4898	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 562—1972	209.	5854	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6439—1972
161.	4901	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 562—1972	210.	5873	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3237—1965
162.	5071	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1970—1974	211.	5902	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 651—1972
163.	6235	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 970—1974	212.	5930	79-02-01	80-01-31	IS : 1165—1975
164.	5308	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 427—1965	213.	5943	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 633—1976
165.	5353	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4)— 1976	214.	6129	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 419—1967
					215.	6286	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1989—1973
					216.	6293	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1026—1966
166.	5389	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1786—1966	217.	6308	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3623—1966
167.	5425	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 280—1972	218.	6317	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1165—1975
168.	5433	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1601—1960	219.	6335	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 916—1975
169.	5440	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1307—1973	220.	6350	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3481—1966
170.	5443	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975	221.	6359	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4159—1976
171.	5456	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 427—1965	222.	6374	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1221—1971
172.	5472	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398 (भाग 1 प्रोर 2)—1976	223.	6380	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1786—1966
					224.	6382	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4431—1967
173.	5473	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 916—1966	225.	6392	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 133—1975
174.	5489	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1601—1960	226.	6396	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1239 (भाग 1)— 1973
175.	5495	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 21—1976					
176.	5505	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1026—1966	227.	6404	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 137—1975
177.	5507	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4654—1974					IS : 3536—1966
178.	5509	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398—1976					IS : 3537—1966
179.	5514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4654—1974					IS : 5660—1970
180.	5522	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914—1978	228.	6408	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2834—1964
181.	5523	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	229.	6410	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968
182.	5525	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5852—1978	230.	6412	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 384—1971
183.	5527	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914—1978	231.	6418	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968
184.	5537	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1308—1974	232.	6427	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325—1970
185.	5541	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	233.	6436	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5086—1969
186.	5542	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975	234.	6439	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
187.	5544	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1786—1966	235.	6440	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
188.	5547	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7121—1973	236.	6441	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
189.	5548	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7122—1973	237.	6442	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2615—1964
190.	5554	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1976	238.	6443	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5456—1969
191.	5557	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4654—1974	239.	6449	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 916—1975
192.	5569	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6695—1972 IS : 7538—1976	240.	6452	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 325—1970
193.	5570	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 325—1970	241.	6471	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 398 (भाग 1 प्रोर 2)—1976
194.	5573	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5346—1976	242.	6500	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1943—1964
195.	5577	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1925—1974					IS : 2566—1965
196.	5593	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 2906—1969	243.	6520	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 2580—1965
197.	5747	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 996—1964	244.	6526	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 5557—1969
198.	5842	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 562—1972	245.	6713	79-04-16	80-04-15	IS : 1485—1976
199.	5843	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 665—1975	246.	6889	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 8054—1976

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
247.	6965	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968	4. 195	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 303—1975	
248.	6994	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 1230—1968	5. 348	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 916—1966	
249.	7083	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 384—1971	6. 430	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	
250.	7093	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1398—1968	7. 432	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 694—1977	
251.	7144	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1786—1966	8. 588	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 694 (Part I & II)—1964	
252.	7162	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 325—1970	9. 610	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 694 (Part I & II)—1964	
253.	7196	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 133—1975	10. 622	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1653—1972	
254.	7198	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4355—1977	11. 633	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 277—1969	
255.	7209	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 410—1977	12. 634	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1029—1970	
256.	7215	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914—1978	13. 635	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975	
257.	7216	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1978	14. 636	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2062—1969	
258.	7217	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1660 (भाग 1) —1967	15. 701	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1675—1971	
259.	7219	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398 (भाग 2) —1976	16. 765	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975	
260.	7227	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4956—1968	17. 776	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 419—1967	
261.	7228	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966	18. 782	79-0-16	80-10-15	IS : 1785 (Part I)—1966 IS : 1785 (Part II)—1967	
262.	7229	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 737—1974	19. 792	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 398—1976	
263.	7231	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6063—1971	20. 793	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	
264.	7234	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966	21. 1041	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1875—1971	
265.	7235	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 7371—1975	22. 1042	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2830—1975	
266.	7242	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4984—1972	23. 1043	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2831—1975	
267.	7243	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1161—1968	24. 1125	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1855—1977 IS : 1856—1977	
268.	7245	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 371—1966	25. 1126	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2266—1977 IS : 2581—1977	
269.	7247	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1153—1975	26. 1146	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 226—1975	
270.	7248	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 958—1975	27. 1147	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1977—1975	
271.	7249	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1674—1970	28. 1150	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1554 (Part I)—1964	
272.	7250	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1154—1957	29. 1216	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1875—1978	
273.	7256	79-10-01	80-09-80	IS : 1786—1966	30. 1277	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975	
274.	7257	79-10-16	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	31. 1276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	
275.	7258	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2818 (भाग 2) —1971	32. 1307	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2645—1975	
276.	7263	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2707—1973	33. 1317	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 3975—1967	
277.	7265	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 834—1975	34. 1338	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 692—1973	
278.	7267	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1786—1966	35. 1340	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3196—1974	
279.	7270	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2906—1969	36. 1462	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1856—1970	
280.	7273	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6595—1972	37. 1490	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 266—1977	
(सं० सं० एम० डी०/13:12)									
ए० पी० बनर्जी, अपर महानिदेशक									

S.O. 732 In pursuance of sub-regulation(1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations 1955, as amended from time, to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that 280 licencees, particulars of which are given in the following Schedule, have been renewed during the month of October, 1979 :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	CM/L No.	Valid From		Indian Standard Specification No.
		(2)	(3)	(4)
1. 24		79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 21-1975
2. 175		79-17-16	80-06-30	IS : 220—1972 IS : 1581—1975
3. 176		79-07-16	80-06-30	IS : 1221—1971

4. 195	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 303—1975
5. 348	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 916—1966
6. 430	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
7. 432	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 694—1977
8. 588	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 694 (Part I & II)—1964
9. 610	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 694 (Part I & II)—1964
10. 622	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1653—1972
11. 633	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 277—1969
12. 634	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1029—1970
13. 635	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975
14. 636	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2062—1969
15. 701	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1675—1971
16. 765	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975
17. 776	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 419—1967
18. 782	79-0-16	80-10-15	IS : 1785 (Part I)—1966 IS : 1785 (Part II)—1967
19. 792	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 398—1976
20. 793	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
21. 1041	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1875—1971
22. 1042	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2830—1975
23. 1043	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2831—1975
24. 1125	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1855—1977 IS : 1856—1977
25. 1126	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 2266—1977 IS : 2581—1977
26. 1146	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 226—1975
27. 1147	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1977—1975
28. 1150	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1554 (Part I)—1964
29. 1216	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1875—1978
30. 1277	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975
31. 1276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
32. 1307	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2645—1975
33. 1317	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 3975—1967
34. 1338	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 692—1973
35. 1340	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3196—1974
36. 1462	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1856—1970
37. 1490	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 266—1977
38. 1515	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 779—1978
39. 1517	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972
40. 1531	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1966
41. 1674	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 3899—1966
42. 1683	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 916—1975
43. 1810	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2266—1970
44. 1814	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 21—1975
45. 1831	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
46. 1841	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 562—1972
47. 1905	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 3564—1975
48. 1954	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 158—1968
49. 2026	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 6175—1971 IS : 7b21—1975
50. 2043	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561—1972
51. 2069	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 280—1972
52. 2073	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 325—1970
53. 2093	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
54. 2094	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975
55. 2104	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976
56. 2110	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 245—1970
57. 2117	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976
58. 2119	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1786—1964
59. 2127	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 5100—1969 IS : 5101—1969 IS : 5102—1969 IS : 5103—1963

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
60. 2186	79-03-01	80-07-21	IS : 10 (Part III) 1974		121. 4508	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 8057—1974	
61. 2262	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3236—1965		122. 4520	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5277—1969	
62. 2276	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 622—1972		123. 455^	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 226—1975	
63. 2282	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567—1973		124. 4604	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 261—1966	
64. 2294	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2480—1973		125. 4613	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 565—1961	
65. 2386	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 323—1959		126. 4614	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 390—1966	
66. 2404	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1221—1971		127. 4616	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972	
67. 2455	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 694—1977		128. 4618	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 565—1975	
68. 2457	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 226—1975		129. 4623	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 286—1964	
69. 2458	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 1977—1975		130. 4627	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4985—1978	
70. 2662	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 4450—1967		131. 4644	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2552—1970	
71. 2664	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 3811—1976		132. 4648	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325—1970	
72. 2735	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1554 (Part I)—1976		133. 4649	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398—1976	
73. 2754	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1783—1974		134. 4656	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561—1972	
74. 2777	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2566—1965		135. 4668	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914—1978	
			IS : 1943—1964		136. 4669	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1978	
75. 2787	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3035 (Part I & II)—1965		137. 4683	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561—1972	
					138. 4686	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 564—1975	
76. 2910	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1786—1966		139. 4695	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4151—1976	
77. 2999	70-01-10	80-09-30	IS : 779—1968		140. 4699	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
78. 3042	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976		141. 4700	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
79. 3077	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2509—1973		142. 4701	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
80. 3117	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 21—1975		143. 4705	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
81. 3146	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 910—1975		144. 4706	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
82. 3168	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1601—1960		145. 4707	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
83. 3171	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1943—1964		146. 4708	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
			IS : 2566—1965		147. 4713	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
84. 3181	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 298—1974		148. 4715	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1848—1971	
85. 3190	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1601—1960		149. 4717	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 694 (Part I)—1977	
86. 3387	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6240—1976		150. 4722	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1601—1960	
87. 3224	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2594—1977		151. 4625	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1601—1960	
88. 3491	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6003—1970		152. 4733	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1520—1972	
89. 3514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2567—1973					IS : 325—1970	
90. 3541	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 498—1978		153. 4734	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4246—1972	
91. 3544	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1660 (Part IV)—1975		154. 4745	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1925—1974	
92. 3557	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1703—1968		155. 4755	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 561—1972	
93. 3562	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2509—1973		156. 4756	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 564—1975	
94. 3576	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 220—1975		157. 5782	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 561—1972	
95. 3577	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1977—1975		158. 4783	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 5346—1975	
96. 3583	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 498—1968		159. 4790	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 7409—1974	
97. 3602	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1601—1970		160. 4898	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 562—1972	
98. 3606	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 6914—1973		161. 4901	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 562—1972	
99. 3.07	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1973		162. 5071	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1970—1974	
100. 3681	79-10-01	80-09-20	IS : 633—1950		163. 5235	79-06-01	80-05-31	IS : 970—1974	
101. 3742	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 5852—1970		164. 5308	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 427—1965	
102. 3780	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3564—1970		165. 5353	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	
103. 3820	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 1786—1966		166. 5389	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1786—1966	
104. 3872	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976		167. 5425	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 280—1972	
105. 3891	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 285—1974		168. 5433	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1601—1960	
106. 3911	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2596—1964		169. 5440	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1307—1973	
107. 3942	79-09-01	80-08-11	IS : 226—1975		170. 5443	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1977—1975	
108. 3959	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1596—1977		171. 5456	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 427—1965	
109. 3960	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 561—1972		172. 5472	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398 (Part I & II)—1976	
110. 4010	79-11-01	80-10-21	IS : 560—1969		173. 5473	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 916—1966	
111. 4024	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2925—1975		174. 5489	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1601—1960	
112. 4110	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7185—1973		175. 5495	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 21—1975	
113. 4282	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914—1973		176. 5505	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1026—1966	
114. 4283	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6915—1973		177. 5507	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4654—1974	
115. 4301	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 204—1974						
116. 4420	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966						
117. 4445	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 325—1970						
118. 4482	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 335—1972						
119. 4491	79-07-16	80-07-15	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976						
120. 4498	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 2834—1964						

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
178.	5509	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 398—1976	232.	6427	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 325—1970
179.	5514	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4654—1974	233.	6436	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5086—1969
180.	5522	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914—1978	234.	6439	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
181.	5523	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	235.	6640	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
182.	5525	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 5852—1978	236.	6441	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 427—1965
183.	4527	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6914—1978	237.	6442	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 2645—1964
184.	5537	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1308—1974	238.	6443	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5456—1969
185.	5341	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975	239.	6449	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 916—1975
186.	5542	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1977—1975	240.	6452	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 325—1970
187.	5544	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1786—1966	241.	6471	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 398 (Part I & II)—1976
188.	5547	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7121—1973	242.	6500	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 1943—1964
189.	5548	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 7122—1973	243.	6520	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 2566—1965
190.	5554	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 633—1975	244.	6526	79-11-16	80-11-15	IS : 5557—1969
191.	5557	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4654—1974	245.	6713	79-04-16	80-04-15	IS : 1485—1976
192.	5569	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6595—1972 IS : 7538—1975	246.	6889	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 8054—1976
193.	5570	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 325—1970	247.	6965	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968
194.	5573	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5346—1975	248.	6994	79-05-16	80-05-15	IS : 1230—1968
195.	5577	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1925—1974	249.	7083	70-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 384—1971
196.	5593	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 2906—1969	250.	7093	79-07-01	80-06-30	IS : 1398—1968
197.	5747	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 996—1964	251.	7144	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 1786—1966
198.	5842	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 562—1972	252.	7162	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 325—1970
199.	5843	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 565—1975	253.	7196	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 133—1975
200.	5844	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 632—1972	254.	7198	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 4355—1977
201.	5845	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 633—1975	255.	7209	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 410—1977
202.	5846	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1307—1973	256.	7215	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6914—1978
203.	5848	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2567—1973	257.	7216	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 6915—1978
204.	5849	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2682—1966	258.	7217	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1660 (Part D)—1967
205.	5850	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2861—1964	259.	7219	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 398 (Part D)—1976
206.	5851	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 4323—1967	260.	7227	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4956—1968
207.	5852	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5277—1969	261.	7228	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
208.	5853	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 5281—1969	262.	7229	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 737—1974
209.	5854	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6439—1972	263.	7231	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 6063—1971
210.	5873	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 3237—1965	264.	7234	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
211.	5902	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 561—1972	265.	7235	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 7371—1975
212.	5930	79-02-01	80-01-31	IS : 1165—1975	266.	7242	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 4984—1972
213.	5943	79-11-01	80-10-31	IS : 633—1975	267.	7243	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1161—1968
214.	6129	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 419—1967	268.	7245	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 371—1966
215.	6286	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1989—1973	269.	7247	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1153—1975
216.	6293	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1026—1966	270.	7248	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 958,—1975
217.	6308	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 3623—1966	271.	7249	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1674—1970
218.	6317	79-08-01	80-07-31	IS : 1165—1975	272.	7250	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1154—1957
219.	6335	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 916—1975	273.	7256	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1786—1966
220.	6350	79-08-16	80-08-15	IS : 3481—1966	274.	7257	79-10-16	80-09-30	IS : 226—1975
221.	6359	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4159—1976	275.	7258	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2818 (Part II)—1971
222.	6374	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1221—1971	276.	7263	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2707—1973
223.	6380	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 1786—1966	277.	7265	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 834—1975
224.	6382	79-09-01	80-08-31	IS : 4431—1967	278.	7267	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 1786—1966
225.	6392	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 133—1975	279.	7270	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 2906—1969
226.	6396	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 1239 (Part D)—1973	280.	7273	79-10-16	80-10-15	IS : 6595—1972
227.	6404	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 137—1975 IS : 3536—1966 IS : 3537—1966 IS : 5660—1970					
228.	6408	79-09-16	80-09-15	IS : 2834—1964					
229.	6410	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968					
230.	6412	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 384—1971					
231.	6418	79-10-01	80-09-30	IS : 1161—1968					

[No. CMD/13 - 12]

A.P. BANERJI, Addl. Director General

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 733.—योग उपक्रम (प्रबन्ध अधिग्रहण) अधिनियम, 1977 (1977 का 21) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उपयोग करने हुए, भारत सरकार एनद्वारा योग एवं प्राकृतिक चिकित्सा की केन्द्रीय अनुसंधान परिषद्, नई दिल्ली के सहायक निदेशक (योग) डा० नरेश कुमार को केन्द्रीय योग अनुसंधान संस्थान एवं विश्वायतन योगाश्रम में 18 फरवरी, 1980 पूर्वाहा० से आगामी आदेशों तक प्रशासक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

आ० नरेश कुमार की नियुक्ति के परिणामस्वरूप, स्वामी मनुवर्या जी ने 18 फरवरी, 1980 पूर्वाहा० से केन्द्रीय योग अनुसंधान संस्थान एवं विश्वायतन योगाश्रम के प्रशासक के पद का कार्यभार छोड़ दिया।

[संख्या आर०-11015/6/80-आयुर्वेद डेस्क-तीन]

टी०वी० अन्टोनी, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1980

NOTIFICATION

S.O. 733.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 4 of the Yoga Undertakings (Taking over of Management) Act, 1977 (21 of 1977) the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. Naresh Kumar, Asstt. Director (Yoga), Central Council for Research in Yoga and Naturopathy, New Delhi as Administrator of the Central Research Institute for Yoga and Vishwayatan Yogashram with effect from the forenoon of the 18th February, 1980 till further orders.

Consequent on the appointment of Dr. Naresh Kumar Swami Manuvaryaji relinquished charge of the post of the Administrator of the Central Research Instt. for Yoga and Vishwayatan Yogashram from the forenoon of the 18th February, 1980.

[No. R. 11015/6/80-Ay. Desk III]

T. V. ANTONY, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 734.—स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय की 18-2-1980 की अधिसूचना सं० आर० 11015/3/80-आयु० डेस्क-तीन, के प्रनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा केन्द्रीय योग अनुसंधान संस्थान एवं विश्वायतन योगाश्रम के प्रबन्ध का कार्य छोड़ देने के परिणामस्वरूप डा० नरेश कुमार ने केन्द्रीय योग अनुसंधान संस्थान एवं विश्वायतन योगाश्रम में प्रशासक के पद का कार्यभार 18-2-1980 (अपराहा०) से छोड़ दिया।

[सं० आर०-11015/6/80-आयु० डेस्क-तीन]

सुन्दर कुमार कथोक, उप-सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th March, 1980

S.O. 734.—Consequent on the relinquishment of the management of the Central Research Institute for Yoga and Vishwayatan Yogashram by the Central Government vide Ministry of Health and Family Welfare Notification No. R. 11015/3/80-Ay. Desk III, dated the 18-2-1980, Dr. Naresh Kumar relinquished the charge of the post of Administrator of the Central Research Institute for Yoga and Vishwayatan Yogashram with effect from 18-2-1980 (Afternoon).

[No. R. 11015/6/80-Ay. Desk III]

S. K. KARTHAK, Dy. Secy.

कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(कृषि और सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 735.—भारत सरकार के कृषि तथा सिंचाई मंत्रालय के कृषि विभाग के 30 दिसंबर, 1978 की इसी संख्या की अधिसूचना को, जो का० आ० सं० 281 दिनांक 20-1-1979 के अन्तर्गत भारत के राजपत्र के भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (2) में प्रकाशित हुई थी, निरस्त समझा जाए, क्योंकि वह का० आ० 162 के अन्तर्गत भारत के राजपत्र में 13-1-79 को छप चुकी है।

[सं० 14-20/76-एल०डी० 1]

एम० एस० खुराना, अध्यक्ष सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION

(Department of Agriculture and Co-operation)

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1980

S.O. 735.—Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agriculture) of even number dated the 30th December, 1978 published in the Gazette of India, Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) vide S.O. No. 281 dated 20-1-1979 may be treated as deleted, as it has already been published in the Gazette dated 13th January, 1979 under S.O. 162.

[No. 14-20/76-LD-II]

M. S. KHURANA, Under Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

आवेदा

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 736.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाध्यक्ष अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम, लिवेन्ड्रम के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक आधोगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यह केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करना बांधनीय समझती है;

अतः, श्रव, आधोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक आधोगिक अधिकारण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० सुदर्सनम डेनियल हैं, जिनका सुलगालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त आधोगिक अधिकारण को न्यायनिर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

जो लिवेन्ड्रम प्रभाग के संबंध में भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम की, दृष्टि पक्षी जीसेक फिलिप, सहायक और श्री सी०एस० श्रीनिवासन, आमे० आपरेटर का वेतन, उनके अपने-अपने वेतनमान में, कमाता: यो स्तर आमे० एक स्तर कम करने संबंधी, कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हक्कार हैं;

[संख्या एल०-17012/23/79-डी० 4(ए)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR
ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th February, 1980

S.O. 736.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Trivandrum and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sudarsanam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in relation to their Trivandrum Division in reducing the pay of Shri Joseph Philip, Assistant, and Shri C. S. Sreecivasan, Adrema Operator, in their respective scales of pay by two stages and one stage respectively by way of punishment, is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?

[No. L-17012/23/79-D.IV(A).]

आवेदा

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1980

का० प्रा० 737.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उग्रदृश्यमनुसूची में विनियोग विषयों के बारे में नेशनल इंशोरेंस कम्पनी, मद्रास के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक आधिकारिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय भवितव्य है;

प्रतः, अब, आधिकारिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-का और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (अ) द्वारा प्रदत्त प्रतियोगी का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक आधिकारिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० मुन्द्रसनम डेनियल होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त आधिकारिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या नेशनल इंशोरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड, मद्रास के प्रबन्धतंत्र की निम्न-स्थिति कर्मकारों का, उच्चतर काडर में पुनः वर्गीकरण न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुत्तरों के हकदार हैं?

क्रम	नाम	पदनाम
सं०		
1.	श्री टी०ए० कृष्णमूर्ति	वरिष्ठ महायक
2.	श्री सी० कृष्णन	वरिष्ठ सहायक
3.	श्री एस० रामनाथन	वरिष्ठ सहायक
4.	श्री टी०एन० गोविन्दराजूल	वरिष्ठ सहायक
5.	श्री ए०पी० शीघ्रप्रभु	वरिष्ठ महायक
6.	श्री जी० शिवसुखमध्यन	महायक
7.	श्री पी०डी० पदमनाथन	सहायक
8.	श्री एस० जानकीरमन	सहायक
9.	श्री एन० रामभूसि	महायक
10.	श्री के० पीताम्बरम	सहायक
11.	श्री ए०के० वैकटरलम	सहायक
12.	श्री जे० राधाकृष्णन	सहायक
13.	श्री ए०पी०डी० सोउजा	सहायक (कार्यवाहक)
14.	श्री पी० लोकिया	सहायक (कार्यवाहक)

[संख्या एल-17012/13/79-डी० 4(ए)]

नव लाल, ईस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1980

S.O. 737.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of National Insurance Company, Madras, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sudarsanam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of National Insurance Company Limited, Madras in not recategorising the undermentioned workmen to higher cadre is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri T.A. Krishnamoorthy	Sr. Assistant
2.	Shri C. Krishnan	Sr. Assistant
3.	Shri S. Ramanathan	Sr. Assistant
4.	Shri T. N. Govindarajulu	Sr. Assistant
5.	Shri A.P. Sreedhara Prabhu	Sr. Assistant
6.	Shri G. Sivasubramanian	Assistant
7.	Shri P.D. Padmanabhan	Assistant
8.	Shri S. Janakiraman	Assistant
9.	Shri N. Ramamurthy	Assistant
10.	Shri K. Peethambaram	Assistant
11.	Shri A.K. Venkatarathnam	Assistant
12.	Shri J. Radhakrishnan	Assistant
13.	Shri A.V.D. 'Souza	Assistant (Officiating)
14.	Shri P. Lokiah	Assistant (Officiating)

[No. L-17012/13/79-D. IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1980

S.O. 738.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Western Coalfields, Kanhan Area (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th March, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(48)/1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Kanhan Area, P.O. Dungarla, District Chhindwara (M.P.) and their workmen represented through the President, Bhartiya Koyal Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (BMS), Chandametta, District Chhindwara (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union—S/Shri S. S. Shakarwar, Advocate & S. B. Singh, President.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Chhindwara (M.P.)

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012(3)/78-D.IV(A) Dated 25th September, 1978, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the action of the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Kanhan Area, in relation to their Hirdagarh Siding, in terminating the services of Shri Harisingh son of Shri Sardar Singh, Dozer Operator, is justified ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

2. After the receipt of the reference the parties were asked to file their respective written statements, rejoinder and documents on different dates. After the pleadings were filed by the parties the case was fixed for evidence. On 7-6-1979 after the admission and denial of documents by the parties each side examined one witness, and 11-6-1979 was fixed for arguments. As the Counsel for the Union could not reach Jabalpur in time the case was adjourned to 12-6-1979. On 12-6-1979 Counsel for the Union, Shri Shakarwar, moved an application for production of documents by the management and for adducing additional evidence. Then the Tribunal fixed 22-6-1979 for reply to the Union's application, for production of documents and for arguments on merits. After hearing the parties, the Tribunal directed the management to produce the called for documents and further allowed the Union to examine one more witness. But before the Union could led the further evidence good sense prevailed in the parties and they have sent a compromise petition by post which was received in the Tribunal on 7-1-1980. On receiving the aforesaid compromise petition 1-2-1980 was fixed for verification of the compromise petition. On 1-2-1980 Counsels for both the parties appeared and verified the same before the Tribunal.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties and am of the opinion that they are fair and reasonable and are beneficial to the workman. I, therefore, make an award in terms of the settlement, the copy of which is annexed herewith as part of this award.

23-2-1980.

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer.

FORM—H

(See Rule—58)

FORM FOR MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

Name of parties

- (a) Representing Employer :—(1) Shri B. K. Sinha, Dy. Personnel Manager, Kanhan Area.
 (2) Shri K. K. Bakshi, Dy. Personnel Manager, (IR) Kanhan Area.

- (b) Representing workman :—Shri S. B. Singh, President, BKMS (BMS) Union, Chandametta.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

The BKMS (BMS) Union raised a dispute with the Conciliation Officer Chhindwara over the alleged illegal termination from services of one Shri Hari Singh S/o Sardar Singh, Ex-Casual worker of Hirdagarh Siding. After failure of the conciliation the case was referred by the Government of India in adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur constituted under section 7(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The Tribunal is seized with case for adjudication. In the meantime the Union approached the management and expressed their desire to settle the case by mutual discussion. Management informed the union that Shri Hari Singh was engaged as casual worker for a temporary period

and his engagement was not continuous. As such his absorption as permanent workman as demanded is not justified under the prevailing law or subsiding agreement between the WCL Management and the union. Management also brought it to the notice of the union that he was regular worker of the transport carriers and he has filed a claim before the ALC (C) Chhindwara against the contractor for the period under dispute. The action of the management in terminating the service of Shri Hari Singh S/o Sardar Singh was justified to which the union has nothing to say. After prolonged discussion, in the interest of Industrial harmony and peaceful labour relation the dispute was resolved on the following terms and conditions.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

1. It is agreed between the parties that Sri Hari Singh S/o Sardar Singh, Ex. Casual worker of Hirdagarh Siding will reinstated on duty as Driver in Cat. V within seven days from the date of signing this settlement and will be posted in Ambara sub area.

2. It is agreed between the parties that union and the workman individually or through any other union will not claim any wages for the period of stoppage from work i.e. from the date of stoppage to the date of signing this settlement.

3. It is agreed between the parties that the period of idleness will be considered as DIES NON and as such will not be entitled for any wages on the principle of No work No pay.

4. It is agreed between the parties that union or workman will not agitate over this demand on any statutory or non-statutory forum as the said settlement has arrived at on the request of the union purely on humanitarian ground.

5. The parties agreed to file the settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur with request to pass an Award in terms of settlement as above.

Representing Employer

— Sd./-

B. K. SINHA,

Dy. Personnel Manager (P)

Representing workman

Sd/-

(S. B. SINGH)

President, BKMS(BMS)

Sd/-

(K. K. BAKSHI)

Dy. PM(IR)

PART OF THE AWARD

A. G. QURESHI,
Presiding Officer.

23-2-80.

[No. L-22012(3)/78-D.IV(A)]

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1980

S.O. 739.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Kanhan Area, in relation to their Ghorawari Colliery and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th March, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(7)/1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Kanhan Area in relation to their Ghorawari Colliery, District Chhindwara and

their workmen represented through the Bhartiya Koya Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (HMS), Chandametta, P.O. Chandametta, District Chhindwara(M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri B. K. Tiwari, General Secretary.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Chhindwara (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated February 22, 1980

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012(11)/78-D.IV(A), dated 20th April, 1978 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the action of the Manager, Ghorawari Colliery in terminating the services of Shri Santram S/o Shri Mussadi, Boring Mazdoor, with effect from the 13th March, 1977 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Both the parties to the dispute were noticed to file their respective written statements on 22-5-1979 on which date the Union filed its written statement but the management took time to file its written statement. The Tribunal had directed the management to file a written statement-cum-rejoinder on 7-6-1979. The management again sought an adjournment on 7-6-1979. Ultimately the management filed its written statement-cum-rejoinder on 22-6-1979 and the Counsel for Union stated that he had not to file any rejoinder on behalf of the Union. The case was then fixed for evidence of parties. But in the meantime, good sense prevailed in the parties and they have jointly sent an application, along with a Memorandum of Settlement, requesting the Tribunal to pass an award in terms of the settlement arrived at between them. Then the Tribunal fixed 2-2-1980 for verification of the terms of settlement on which date the parties appeared and verified the settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties and am of the opinion that the terms of the settlement are eminently fair and reasonable and are in the interest of the workman. I, therefore, make an award in terms of the settlement, the copy of which is annexed herewith as part of this award.

22-2-1980

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer.

FORM—H

(See Rule 58)

FORM FOR MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) Representing employer : 1. Shri Arun Narayan, Manager Ghorawari Colliery, Kanhan Area.
2. Shri B. K. Sinha, Dy. Personnel Manager (P) Kanhan.
3. Shri K. K. Bakshi, Dy. Personnel Manager (IR) Kanhan.
- (b) Representing workman : 1. Shri B. K. Tiwari General Secretary BKKMS (BMS) Union Chandametta.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

The BKKMS (BMS) Union raised a dispute with the Conciliation Officer, Chhindwara over the alleged illegal termination from services of one Shri Santram S/o Mussadi, a Boring Mazdoor of Ghorawari Colliery. After the failure of the conciliation the case was referred by the Government of India in adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur constituted under section 7(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The Tribunal has seized the case for adjudication as per Order dated New Delhi the 20th April 1979. In the meantime the union and the management expressed their desire to settle the case by mutual discussion. Accordingly the parties met on 11-12-1979. The action of the management in terminating the services of Shri Santram S/o Mussadi

was justified to which the union has nothing to say. After prolonged discussion the management agreed to take sympathetic attitude on humanitarian ground in the interest of good industrial relation with the union and with a view to finally settle this request of the union on humanitarian ground. Accordingly the settlement arrived on the following terms.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- It is agreed between the parties that Shri Santram S/o Mussadi, Boring Mazdoor of Ghrowari Colliery will be taken on duty in the same capacity on humanitarian ground from the date of signing this settlement.
- It is agreed between the parties that union and the workman individually or through any other union will not claim any wages for the period of termination i.e. from the date of termination to the date of signing this settlement.
- It is agreed between the parties that this is full and final settlement of this demand and the period of idleness will be considered as 'NON DIES' 'No work no pay'.
- It is agreed between the parties that union or workman will not agitate over this demand on any statutory or non-statutory forum.
- The parties agreed to file the settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur with request to pass Award in terms of settlement as above.

Representing employer

Sd/-

1. (Arun Narayan)

Sd/-

2. (B. K. Sinha)

Sd/-

3. (K. K. Bakshi)

Representing workman

Sd/-

(B. K. Tiwari)

Genl. Secy.

BKKMS (BMS)

PART OF THE AWARD

Sd/-

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer

22-2-1980

[No. L-22012(ii)/78-D.IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 6th March, 1980

S.O. 740.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Newton Chickli Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Pench Area, Parasia and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 4th March, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(34)/1978

PARTIES :

Employer, in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Pench Area, Parasia and their workmen represented through the Secretary, M.P. Rashtriya Koya Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (INTUC) Chandametta, P.O. Parasia, District Chhindwara (M.P.).

APPEARANCES:

For Union—Shri Gulab Gupta, Advocate and Shri S. Bharadwaj, Secretary of the Union.

For Management.—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal DISTRICT : Chhindwara (M.P.)

AWARD

The Government of India, in exercise of the powers conferred to it by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, Pench Area, Parasia and their workmen, for adjudication to the Tribunal in respect of the matters specified in the following Schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Newton Chickli Colliery in terminating the services of

Sarva-Shri Mahesh S/o Pararam, Krishan, S/o Munnalal, Jagannath S/o Ramdean Antram S/o Rehmanlal, Prem S/o Pararam Rabim Khan S/o Reham is justified ? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled ?"

2. The case of the workmen in a epitome is that from 1-1-1974 to 24-9-1975 the workmen had worked as Tub repairers at Newton Chickli Colliery. On 25-9-1975, the workmen were given appointment orders as "Badli Departmental Piece Rated Workers" for the period of three months with effect from 1-10-1975. Thereafter the appointment was extended for a period of two months from 1-1-1976, then again for a period of three months from 1-3-1976. It was further extended from 1-6-1976 to 13-8-1976 and thereafter the services of all the seven workmen were terminated with effect from 1-10-1976. As such, according to the workmen, they served at Newton Chickli Colliery from January, 1974 to September, 1976 i.e. about two years and nine months on the permanent nature of jobs. They were also paid Provident Fund Bonus for the year 1976-77, Quarterly Bonus, Paid holidays wages, Injury wages etc., and so they acquired the status of the permanent workmen. Hence their stoppage from work with effect from 1-10-1976 was in contravention of Section 12A of the Certified Standing Orders and Section 25F(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said stoppage of work is also in utter disregard of Section 22(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The workmen have further averred that when the workmen were appointed as Badli Departmental Piece Rated Workers initially on 1-10-1975, the appointment orders appointing them as Badli Workmen were written in English and were not explained to the workmen. So they could not know that their status had been changed from the permanent workers to the Badli Workers. It is also pleaded that according to the Rules or Standing Orders of the Colliery there is no post of a Departmental Piece Rated Worker. So they could not be appointed against a post which was not in existence according to the Rules or the Standing Orders. Therefore, despite the orders of appointment dated 25-9-1975 treating the workmen as Badli Departmental Piece Rated Workers, they continued to be the permanent workmen, and the said appointments orders are an example of unfair labour practice.

4. According to the management, the workmen were appointed from 1-10-1975 as Badli Workers for a temporary period of three months. Subsequently, the period was extended for a short duration. The workmen were employed only when there were vacancies and none of the workmen were appointed for an unlimited period but were appointed only on a temporary basis. The management took a sympathetic view and provided work as and when available. It was made clear to the workmen at the time of appointment, that the work is purely temporary. As the workmen had not completed 190 days of attendance they could not acquire the status of a permanent workmen. It was also pleaded that there is a man power freeze in the entire coal

industry and in Newton Sub-Area there is surplus labour. Hence it is not possible for the industry to absorb additional hands. The industry is already suffering financial losses and is unable to bear the additional financial burden.

(5) In the rejoinder filed by the management, for the first time it was pointed out that one of the workmen Rahim Khan was never appointed by the management and due to oversight it was not brought to the notice earlier. Regarding the tub repairing job alleged to have been done by the workmen, it was pleaded that the work of tub repairing was carried on by one Shri Mahesh, Contractor, and there was no employer-employee relationship between the workmen and the management. As regards the termination of the services, it was averred by the management that there was no termination of service because the appointments were only for a specific period whenever vacancies occurred and the term of employment could be brought to an end by efflux of time. The management also denied the commission of the breach of the Standing Orders.

The management also raised legal objections about the maintainability of the reference on the grounds that since there was no demand on the management by the workmen, there could be no industrial dispute. The reference is vague and the Government has not applied its mind and made the reference mechanically. The workmen were not members of the union and therefore the union could not raise the dispute.

6. In my opinion the objections about the maintainability are devoid of any merit. The present dispute was raised by the workmen before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Chhindwara vide letter No. INTUC/6/77/300 Dated 26-8-1977 and the management admittedly participated in the conciliation proceedings. Shri Pavgi had represented the management as a Senior Personnel Officer of the management and during the proceedings the management had not raised an objection that the dispute was not raised earlier by the workmen. The management disputed the demands of the workmen before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Chhindwara and as such the dispute came into existence much earlier than making of the reference by the Central Government. Further more, the workmen have specifically pleaded that the Union had raised the demands initially with the management on 11-9-76 vide letter No. INTUC/5/76/844 and again made the same demand vide letter No. INTUC/5/6/77/202 dated 19-7-1977. The management has not rebutted this averment by leading any evidence before this Tribunal. Hence the validity of the reference cannot be challenged on this count.

7. Similarly, the cause of the seven workmen was espoused by the INTUC Union and during conciliation proceedings also Mr. S. S. Bharadwaj, Secretary of the INTUC Union, represented the workmen before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Chhindwara, but the management did not raise any objection that the workmen are not the members of the INTUC Union and Shri Bharadwaj has got no right to represent them. It has come in the evidence of the workmen that they were appointed through the INTUC Union. There is no rebuttal by the management on this point. Hence this objection taken by the management is also without any merit.

As regards, the allegation of vagueness of the reference, the learned Council for the management could not show as to how the reference is vague and he has also not been able to point out the circumstances which may lead to an inference that the Central Government has not applied its mind and has made the reference mechanically. Hence this objection is also without any force.

8. Now the point which arises for determination is whether all the seven workmen were employed by the management and whether they had acquired the status of the permanent workmen.

To prove their respective contentions, the management and the workmen have adduced oral evidence and filed documents. The workmen have examined Antram, Sher Singh and Mahesh and the management had examined Sohan Lal Soni—Asstt. Manager, O. P. Mehta—Subordinate Engineer and Deepak Menon.

9. First of all I shall deal with the question of appointment of Rahim Khan by the management. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that during the conciliation proceedings the Senior Personnel Officer of the management had admitted that Rahim Khan was one of their workmen. Even at the time of the filing the written statement before the Tribunal the management did not plead that Rahim Khan was not their workman. In the rejoinder, the management has raised this plea for the first time that Rahim Khan was not employed by them. The management did not adduce any evidence to show that Rahim Khan was not employed by the management. It is argued by the learned Council for the management, Shri P. S. Nair, that it was for the workman to provide that he was employed by the management and the onus was not on the management to prove that he was not employed by the management. I am unable to subscribe the argument advanced by the learned Counsel. As stated above, the representative of the management had all through the conciliation proceedings admitted that Rahim Khan was employed as their workman. Even at the time of filing the written statement the management did not say that Rahim Khan was not employed as their workman. Therefore, if the management wanted to rebut or explain the admission made by its own representative during the conciliation proceedings than at least Mr. Pavgi who represented the management during conciliation proceedings could have entered into the witness box and stated that under what circumstances he had made that admission. But the management did not examine Shri Pavgi. The management has examined one Shri Deepak Menon (M.W.3) who states that when Shri Pavgi asked him to look into the record of the workmen then he examined the record of the workmen and found that Rahim was not employed as the workman. According to him, he is making the statement after seeing the B Form, Bonus Register and Attendance Register. But the management has not produced any of the documents to show that Rahim Khan was not employed as a workman. The statement of this witness does not help the management because firstly the management has not produced the documents on which the statement of this witness is based and secondly if this witness had, after going through the record, found out the Rahim Khan was not an employee, then this fact should have found place in the written statement filed by the management, and the management should have explained the circumstances under which Shri Pavgi had made an admission that Rahim Khan was their workman.

10. As against the evidence of management, the witnesses of workmen, Antram and Mahesh, have stated that Rahim was working with them as a workman and was employed by the management. The evidence of the workmen witnesses is more reliable and is supported by the admission of the management during conciliation proceedings, on this point. Therefore I hold that Rahim Khan was also an employee of the management along with the other six workmen.

11. Now it has to be decided as to what was the status of the workmen when they were stopped from work.

In this respect, first of all it has to be determined as to in what capacity the workmen were working as Tub Repairers from 1-1-1974 to 24-9-1975. On this point, W.W.1 Antram, states that on 1-1-1974 he was appointed to work at Newton Chickli Colliery as Tub Repairer. He was not given any appointment letter. The Manager had given him verbal order to work as Tub Repairers. Similarly other persons were also appointed along with him. Their names are Krishna, Rahim, Nares and Prem. According to him, orders for the repair work used to be given by the Foreman. One Mr. Baboolal was the Foreman. The Mistry also used to instruct him about the work and the Mistry was Hotilal. Other mistics was supervising their work and their names were Vishram and Sher Singh. There was an attendance register and the entries in that register were made by either Foreman or the Mistics. The Foreman and the Mistics used to sign this register at the end of the week. The payment was not made individually, but a voucher was prepared in the name of one of the labourers and the payment was made to that person and then distributed amongst all the workers.

12. In cross-examination this witness states that the payment voucher used to be prepared in the name of Mahesh. Mahesh used to take the payment and distribute it amongst the workmen. He denies the suggestion that Mahesh was

a contractor and they were working under him as labourers. But he admits that Mahesh used to sign the bills on their behalf. W.W.2, Sher Singh Vishwakarma states that Mahesh and six other workers were working as Tub Repairers under him. They worked for 1-1/2 years to 2 years. He and other persons used to instruct the workmen as to how the tubs should be repaired and also used to supervise the work. Mahesh also used to work along with the other labourers. The workmen used to make entries in the register themselves and he used to sign the attendance register as Mistry. In addition to this witness, Vishram Mistry and Baboolal Mistry also used to check the register and sign it. The wages were distributed amongst the workmen equally.

In cross-examination this witness denies the suggestion that Mahesh used to give work to the other six workmen. However, he is not in a position to say whether Mahesh was a contractor. He further states that on the orders of one Shri Saxena, Engineer, he used to supervise the work of these workmen.

13. W.W.3, Mahesh also makes the similar statement and corroborates the testimony of Antram and Sher Singh. This witness further states that the workers used to get the pay through the vouchers and the payment was checked by the Labour Officer. The payment voucher was made in the name of this witness and all the workers used to distribute the wages equally. The workmen were asked to fill in the attendance in the Attendance Register and the supervisor of the work of Tub-repairing used to check the Attendance Register and sign it. This witness has produced the Register and states that this Register was checked every week by the Foreman, Baboolal, Sher Singh and Vishram. He used to go to the Cashier with this register and the payment vouchers used to be prepared on the basis of this register.

14. From the testimony of the above witnesses supported by the Attendance Register, it appears that all the seven workmen used to work as Tub Repairers at the Newton Chickli Colliery and their work was supervised by one Shri Saxena, Engineers, Baboolal, Sher Singh Vishwakarma and Hor Singh Mistics. Although the attendance register was kept by the workmen but it was checked by the supervisory staff and signed by them. The payment was made to the workmen on the basis of the Attendance Register. The payment was not made individually but a voucher was prepared in the name of Mahesh and after receiving the payment the workmen used to distribute the wages equally amongst themselves.

15. In rebuttal, the management witness No. 1, Sohan Lal Soni, states that Mahesh used to work with the management as a contractor. During that period Mahesh was not in the employment of the management. Sher Singh, Vishram and Baboo Lal were never deputed to supervise the work of Mahesh. In cross-examination this witness states that although Mahesh was working as contractor there was neither any agreement nor any letter appointing him as a contractor. He further states that Asstt. Engineer used to give instructions to Mahesh for getting the work of Tub-repairing done. There were no specific orders in writing about the rate of Tub-repairing. No tenders for tub-repairing were invited and the rates used to be settled by Mahesh and Engineer. During the year 1974-75 about six or seven permanent workmen were employed for the job of tub-repairing. He admits that the job of tub repairing is a time rated job.

The second witness for the management, O. P. Mehta, states that Mahesh was not appointed as a workman during the year 1974-75. Mahesh was a contractor and he used to be given the work every day. He used to consult the Engineer and the Manager before getting the work for the day. He also states that Baboo Lal, Sher Singh and Vishram were not appointed to supervise the work of Mahesh. Whatever work was being done by Mahesh, was assessed at the end of the week and the Engineer used to send the list of the work done by Mahesh to the Manager and then payment was being made. This witness in cross-examination admits that there was no written contract between the management and Mahesh for doing the work. He used to direct Mahesh as to what work should be done and then he used to check the completion of the work. According to this witness Mahesh himself used to work along with the other labourers.

M.W. 3, Deepak Menon, states that Mahesh used to work as a contractor for tub-repairing, from 1974 till September, 1975. In cross-examination this witness states that because Mahesh used to send the bill of his work, therefore he treats him as a contractor. There is no written contract with the management.

16. All the above witnesses of the management have stated that Mahesh was a contractor and that although there was no written contract and the tenders were not invited still he used to work according to the instructions of the Engineer and the Manager and used to get his payment at the end of the week for which he used to submit bills of the work done and the payment used to be made according to those bills. But the management has not produced a single bill or any payment voucher before this Tribunal. It has also not been stated as to under what powers such an unwritten contractual work was being carried out and how the payment was made. Whether the payment was made for the number of workmen and days of the works or for the number of tubs repaired. The workmen have produced the Attendance Register which is signed by the employees of the management, who according to the workmen, were supervising their work and the payment was made on the basis of the attendance register. The management could have easily rebutted the statements of the witnesses of the workmen by producing the payment vouchers and the bills. But for the reasons best known to the management no such documents have been produced. Therefore, I am inclined to believe the testimony of the workmen witnesses which is supported by the Attendance Register and hold that actually all the workmen were employed by the management to work as Tub Repairers, but they were not enrolled as regular workmen. One of the workmen Mahesh was treated as the contractor and the payments were made to Mahesh for all the workmen.

17. Now, even assuming that Mahesh was the Contractor and other six workmen were working with him then also in view of the facts of this case all the workmen shall in law be treated as the employees of the management.

In, D. C. Dewan Mohideen Sahib & Sons and another Vs. United Bidi Workers' Union, Salem, and another (AIR 1966 SC. 644), the appellants concern had appointed certain contractors for manufacture of biris. The contractors took leaves and tobacco from the appellants and employed workmen for manufacturing biris. After biris were manufactured the contractors took them back from the workmen and delivered them to the appellants. The procedure of the work was that the workmen took leaves to their home and cut them there. However, the process of actual rolling by filling the leaves in tobacco took place at the contractors factories. The contractors kept no attendance register for the workmen. There was no condition that they should come and go at the fixed hours, nor were the workmen bound to come every day. The contractors said that they could not take any action if a workman absented without leave. The payment of the workmen was made at piece rates. The appellant fixed the price of the tobacco and leaves supplied to the contractors who took them to the places where work of rolling was done and gave them to the workmen next day. The manufactured biris were taken by the contractors to the appellants who paid certain price for the manufactured biris after deducting therefrom the cost of the tobacco and the leaves already fixed. The balance was paid to the contractors who in their turn paid to the workmen their wages and whatever remained after paying the workmen would be the contractors' commission for the work done.

18. In the above circumstances, the Supreme Court held that the so-called contractors were mere agents or branch managers of the appellants and were under the control of the appellants. This system has been evolved to avoid regulations under the Factories Act. The contract is practically one sided. In that the proprietor can at his choice supply raw materials or refuse to do so. The so-called contractor having no rights to insist upon the raw materials supplied to him and the contractor cannot employ more than 9 persons in his factory hence it was held that the workers employed by the so-called contractors are the workmen of the appellants.

19. In my opinion, the ratio of the above case is fully applicable to the facts of this case. In the instant case also the so-called contractor, Mahesh, could not insist on the work because there was no written contract between the

management and Mahesh. The work of Mahesh and his co-worker was solely dependent at the mercy and goodwill of the Manager and the Engineer. The number of workmen to be employed was also restricted because it was again the choice of the management as to for how many workmen the work should be given to Mahesh. There was a direct control over the work of all the seven workmen by the management. The payment voucher was prepared on the basis of the attendance register which was checked by the supervisory staff of the Company and the work was done in the premises of the management's colliery. Therefore there can be no doubt that the seven workmen employed by the management for the tub-repairing job through the so called contractor, Mahesh, were actually the employees of the management. My above view is further fortified by another recent judgment of the Supreme Court, in Royal Talkies, Hyderabad and others Vs. Employees' State Insurance Corporation (AIR 1978 SC 1478) wherein it has been held that the employees of a Cycle Stand and a Canteen Contractor run in a Cinema Theatre, are the employees of the Cinema Owner.

In the result I hold that all the seven workmen were the employees of the management and they worked as Tub-Repairers from 1-1-1974 to 30-9-1975 with the Newton Chickli Colliery.

19-A. From the Attendance Register produced it is manifest that from 1-1-1974 to 31-12-1974, Antram had worked for 299 days, Mahesh had worked for 305 days, Prem had worked for 298 days, Jagannath had worked for 300 days, Rahim Khan had worked for 302 days, Naresh had worked for 304 days and Krishna had worked for 298 days, and from 1-1-1975 to 30-9-1975 Antram had worked for 261 days, Mahesh for 258 days, Prem for 259 days, Jagannath for 256 days, Rahim for 260 days, Naresh for 261 days and Krishna had worked for 255 days.

20. The service conditions of the Newton Chickli Colliery are governed by the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Clause 3(a), (b), (d) (e) of the Standing Orders are as under :—

(3) (a) "Workman" shall be classified as :—

- (i) Permanent
- (ii) Probationers
- (iii) Badlies or substitutes.
- (iv) Temporary
- (v) Apprentices
- (vi) Casual.

(b) A "Permanent" workman is one who is appointed for an unlimited period or who has satisfactorily put in three months' continuous service in a permanent post as a probationer.

(d) A "Badli" or substitute is one who is appointed in the post of a permanent workman or a probationer who is temporarily absent. But he would cease to be a "badli" on completion of a continuous period of services of one year (190 attendances in the case of any other workmen) in the same post or other post or posts in the same capacity or earlier if the post is vacated by the permanent workman or probationer would be deemed to be permanent after completion of the probationary period.

(e) A "Temporary" workman is a workman who has been engaged for work which is of an essentially temporary nature likely to be finished within a limited period. The period within which it is likely to be finished should also be specified but it may be extended from time to time, if necessary."

21. The workmen have not pleaded as to what was their status when they were employed by the management on 1-1-1974. Similarly the management has also not pleaded that the appointments of the workmen on 1-1-1974 were in any of the clauses specified in Clause 3(a). From the evidence on record it appears that the workmen were appointed for an unlimited period. So, they can be classified as "permanent workmen". However, even if the workmen may be treated as 'badlies or substitutes' then also after the completion of a continuous period of service of one year and having

put in 190 attendances, the workmen shall acquire the status of "permanent workmen". As has been stated above the workmen had put in more than 190 days' attendances in the year 1974 and again from 1-1-1975 to 30-9-1975 had put in attendance of more than 240 days. Hence by virtue of Clause 3 of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company, all the workmen shall be deemed to be the permanent workmen. As such, they were the permanent workmen on 25-9-1975, when the orders appointing them as Badli Departmental Piece Rated workers were issued by the management.

21. In view of the above finding, it is manifest that all the seven workmen were employed by the management as Tub Repairers which is a time rated job according to the Appendix V, Serial 1, under the head of Category II (Semi-skilled lower) of the Central Wage Board Recommendations for the Coal Mining Industries and they had acquired the status of the permanent workmen. So if the management wanted to effect a change in the conditions of service and wanted to put them in the category of Badli Departmental Piece Rated Workers; then that change being to the prejudice of the workmen, a notice of change under Sec. 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was necessary. But the management has not followed the procedure prescribed in Sec. 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act. Hence the appointment letters dated 25-9-1975 designating the workmen as Departmental Piece Rated Workers with effect from 1-10-1975 is manifestly in contravention of the provisions contained in Sec. 9A of the Act. On the basis of such appointment letters the management cannot claim that the status of the workmen from 1-10-1975 was that of the Badli Departmental Piece Rated Workers. The workmen having acquired the status of the permanent workmen, the condition of a fresh appointment of three months, which was to expire with the efflux of time could also not be imposed without resorting to the procedure contained in Sec. 9A. Hence it is held that till the date of the termination of their services the workmen enjoyed the status of the permanent workmen and their services could not come to an end merely by the efflux of time.

22. It is not in dispute before me that while terminating the services of the workmen, the management did not follow the procedure prescribed in Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act and has also not complied with the instructions contained in Clause 13 of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company (Ex. M/1). Therefore, the order of termination being in flagrant breach of Clause 13 of the Certified Standing Orders and there being non-compliance of the requirements of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947, the orders of termination of services of workmen are invalid. It is settled law that the provisions of Sec. 25F of I.D. Act are mandatory and an order of retrenchment passed in contravention of the said section is null and void. Hence the order of termination being void, the workmen are entitled to reinstatement with back wages.

23. The reinstatement has been opposed by the management on the ground that the Company is under going a loss and cannot provide a surplus hand. But the Company has not produced any cogent, reliable and documentary evidence in support of its contention. So, this cannot be a ground for refusing reinstatement.

24. In the result, I hold that the action of the management of Newton Chickli in terminating the services of S/Shri Mahesh, Krishan, Jagannath, Antram, Prem, Naresh and Rahim Khan, was not justified and the workmen are entitled for the reinstatement with back wages from the date of their termination, till their reinstatement. The basis of the computation of the back wages to the workmen shall be the average wage which each workman was getting at the time of termination of his service. The management shall pay Rs. 100 as the costs of this dispute to the workmen.

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer

Dated : 25-2-1980.

[No. L-22012(26)/77-D.IV(B)]
SHASHI BHUSHAN, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 741.—मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कॉल लिमिटेड के बरोग सेक्टर के अन्तर्गत आने वाली केसुरगढ़ कोलियरी, डाकघर बाष्पमारा, धनबाद (बिहार) के प्रबन्धतान से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच,

जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व बिहार कोलियरी कामगार यूनियन, रिफूजी मार्किट, टैम्पल रोड, धनबाद, बिहार करती है, एक आद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मकारों ने आद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यस्थम के लिए निर्देशित करने का कागर कर लिया है, और उक्त माध्यस्थम करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है;

अब, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के प्रत्युत्तर में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थम करार को, जो उसे 23 फरवरी, 1980 को मिला था, प्रतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

(करार)

(आद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

प्रकारों के नाम :

1. बिहार कोलियरी कामगार यूनियन
(बी०सी०के०य००) (सी०आई०टी०य००) रिफूजी मार्किट, टैम्पल रोड, धनबाद (बिहार) ।

2. मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कॉल लिमिटेड के बरोग सेक्टर के अन्तर्गत आने वाली केसुरगढ़ कोलियरी, डाकघर बाष्पमारा धनबाद (बिहार) ।

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

1. श्री एच०एम० तिवारी, महाप्रबंधक, बरोग सेक्टर कोकिंग कॉल लिमिटेड ।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

2. श्री एस० के० बराही, महामंत्री, बिहार कोलियरी कामगार यूनियन (पी०आई०टी०य००), रिफूजी मार्किट, टैम्पल रोड, धनबाद (बिहार) ।

प्रकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित विवाद को श्री डॉ श्री० रामचन्द्रन, केन्द्रीय शमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय), धनबाद के माध्यस्थम के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार किया गया है।

1. विनिर्दिष्ट विवादग्रस्त विषय :

1973 से 1976 की प्रदूषित के दौरान केसुरगढ़ कोलियरी में कर्मकारों के निम्नलिखित सेटों में से कौन से सेट वाले कर्मकार असली कर्मजारी थे और नैमित्तिक रोजगार के हकदार थे।

नाम	नाम
1. श्री रामदास बी०पी०	1. श्री पासी राम बी०पी०
2. श्री गुलाब मिहू बी०पी०	2. श्री परमानन्द
3. श्रीमती अमलबा कामिन	3. मंगली कामिन
4. ——जगदीश रविधास	4. श्री काशीराम बी०पी०
5. ——परबतिया फैन	5. श्रीमती तिनि कामिन
6. श्री मुनीगम बी०पी०	6. श्री बिजोय राम बी०पी०
7. श्रीमती पिल्ली बाई	7. पोनी बाई कामिन
8. श्रीमती मुहावती कामिन	8. श्रीमती सेनमणी कामिन
9. श्रीमती गोवती भोविन	(कामिन)
	9. रेणु बाई कामिन

2. विधायक के पक्षकारों का विवरण, 1. महामंडी, बिहार कोलियरी काम-
जिसमें पर्यावरण स्वास्थ्य या गर मूनियन (सी०आई०टी०य०)
उपक्रम का नाम और पक्ष भी रिफूजी मार्किट, टेम्पल रोड,
समिलित है। धनबाद।
3. प्रमाणगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाली मूनियन का नाम। 2. महाप्रबन्धक, बरोरा लोड, भारत
4. प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या 1886 3. महाप्रबन्धक कोल लिमिटेड, धनबाद
5. विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की रिफूजी मार्किट, टेम्पल रोड,
प्राक्कलित संख्या 9 धनबाद।

इस यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर आबद्धकर होगा। मध्यस्थ प्रपना पंचाट समुचित सरकार द्वारा राजपत्र में इस करार के प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से तीन मास की कालावधि या इन्हें और समय के भीतर और हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिंकित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा। यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता तो मध्यस्थम के लिए निदेश स्वतं रद्द हो जाएगा और हम नए माध्यस्थम के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले
(एस० के० बक्सी)
महामंडी,
बिहार कोलियरी कामगर मूनियन

ह०/—
(एस०एन० द्विपाठी)
महाप्रबन्धक, बरोरा लोड
धनबाद

साक्षी

1. ह०/—एस०बी० मिश्र
2. ह०/—एन०एल० मिश्र

मैं मध्यस्थ के रूप में प्रपनी सहमति देता हूँ।

ह०/— बी०बी० रामचन्द्रन
केन्द्रीय प्रमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय),
धनबाद

[संख्या ए०-20013/3/80-बी० ३(ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1980

S.O. 741.—Whereas an industrial exists between the employees in relation to the management of Kessurgarh Colliery under Barora Area of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Baghmara, Dhanbad (Bihar) and their workmen represented by Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, Refugee Market, Temple Road, Dhanbad, Bihar ;

And whereas, the said employers and their workmen have by a written agreement under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government a copy of the said arbitration agreement ;

Now therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement which was received by it on the 23rd February 1980.

AGREEMENT

(Under section 10A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947)

Name of the parties :— (i) Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (BCKU) (CITU), Refugee Market, Temple Road, Dhanbad (Bihar).

(ii) Management of Kessurgarh Colliery under Barora Area of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Baghmara, Dhanbad (Bihar).

Representing employer :—

Shri H.N. Tripathy, General Manager, Barora Area, Bharat Coking Coal Limited.

Representing workmen :—

Shri S.K. Bakshi, General Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (CITU) Refugee Market, Temple Road, Dhanbad (Bihar).

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri D.V. Ramchandran, RLC (C), Dhanbad.

(i) Special matters in dispute : Which of the following sets of workmen were genuine employees at Kessurgarha Colliery during the period from 1973 to 1976 and entitled for casual employment.

Name	Name
1. Sri Ramdas B.P.	1. Sri Patiram B.P.
2. Sri Gulab Singh B.P.	2. Sri Parmanand.
3. Smt. Amlwa Kamin.	3. Mangli Kamin.
4. Jagdish Rabidas.	4. Sri Kashiram B.P.
5. Parvati Kain.	5. Smt. Nini Kamin.
6. Shri Muniram B.P.	6. Sri Bijoy Ram B.P.
7. Smt. Pilli Bai.	7. Poni Bal Kamin.
8. Smt. Suhanwan Kamin.	8. Smt. Sonmani Kamin.
9. Smt. Robni Bhabin.	9. Reetu Bai Kamin.

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved :—

(1) General Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (CITU), Refugee Market, Temple Road, Dhanbad.
(2) General Manager, Barora Area, Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Dhanbad (Bihar).

(iii) Name of the Union representing workman in question. Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (CITU), Refugee Market, Temple Road, Dhanbad.

(iv) Total No. of workman employed in the undertaking affected. 1866

(v) Estimated No. of work- 9

man affected or likely to
be affected by dispute

(vi) We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator be binding on us. The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of 3 months from the date of publication of the agreement in official gazette by appropriate Govt. or within such further time as extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period afore-mentioned, the reference to the arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

Representing workman

Sd/-

(S.K. BAXI)
General Secretary,
Bihar Colliery Kangar Union.

Representing the employer

Sd/-

(H.N. TRIPATHY)
General Manager,
Barora Area, Dhanbad.WITNESS : (1) Sd/- (S.B. Mitra)
(2) Sd/- (N.L. Singh) 19-2-80

I hereby give my consent as an Arbitrator.

Sd/-

(D.V. RAMACHANDRAN)
Regional Labour Commissioner (C)
Dhanbad.

[No. L-20013(3)/80-D. III(A).]

S.O. 742.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Amlabad Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th March 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3 DHANBAD

Reference No. 8 of 1978

PRESENT :

Shri P. Ramakrishna,
Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Amlabad Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers

—Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen

—Shri J. D. Lal, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : Bihar

AWARD

Dated, the 23rd February, 1980

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication by their Order No. L-20012/160/77-DIII(A) dated 30-1-1978.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Amlabad Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P. O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad in stopping from work of Sarvashri Madan Mohan Vishwakarma and Sachidanand Vishwakarma, Mazdoors (in smithy shop) from September 1972, is justified ? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled ?”

2. On behalf of the workmen herein the Secretary of the Bihar Colliery Kangar Union has filed a written statement of claim stating that the two concerned workmen herein Sarvashri Madan Mohan Vishwakarma and Sachidanand Vishwakarma worked for a number of years prior to 1972 in Amlabad Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited under the Contractor Shri S. N. Vishwakarma. With effect from 24-4-72 the management had decided to departmentalise the Tub repairing and general Smithy work after abolishing the system of getting the work done through Contractors. Consequent upon departmentalisation, the two workmen herein along with the other persons engaged by the former contractor were taken on the rolls of the company on a regular basis. The concerned workmen continued to work at this Colliery till September, 1972 when the management stopped them from work without notice or assigning any reason whatsoever. The several representations made by them to the management went unheeded. The action of the management in stopping the workmen herein from work besides being arbitrary, discriminatory and illegal is also opposed to the provisions of Section 17(1) of the Coking Coal Mines Nationalisation Act—1972. The Union contends that the workmen herein were the regular employee of the colliery on the relevant date. It is prayed that the concerned workmen may be directed to be reinstated in their original jobs with continuity of service and back wages.

3. In their written statement, the management inter-alia plead that this dispute has become stale as it is raised 4 years after the concerned workmen were stopped from work. The existence of employer and employee relationship is denied. According to them the concerned workmen were found superfluous and therefore stopped from work. They contended that it is the prerogative of the management to determine the strength of its labour force. They admit having taken some of the workmen engaged by the former contractor on a regular basis, having regard to their suitability and job performance. They say that the two workmen herein did not even work for the Contractor for any length of time to merit consideration. It is their further case that the two concerned workmen were employed by them as Badlis and/or casual mazdoors as and when required. Their employment automatically comes to an end on the expiry of their period of engagement or completion of work. Thus they say that the workmen concerned Sarvashri S. N. Vishwakarma and M. N. Vishwakarma were engaged intermittently for a total period of 49 days and of 50 days respectively during the week ending 29-4-72 and 25-9-72. They say that during this period neither of them worked for a full week. It is submitted that in the circumstances the question of the management stopping them from service could not have arisen. Their services automatically came to an end.

4. The Union filed a rejoinder to the management's written statement for the most part denying the several averments made therein. They further say that the register and record maintained by the contractor were handed over to the management as per their directions and on that basis the workmen herein along with the other employees of the Contractor were taken on the rolls of the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. It is pleaded that the management is not fair in stopping the concerned workmen alone from service while retaining all the other workmen engaged by the previous contractor. They assert that the concerned workmen worked for the contractor for a sufficiently long time. According to them the length of service put in by them under the contractor is irrelevant for the purpose of the present dispute. The averment that the workmen herein were engaged as casual or Badli workers and that their employment came to an automatic end the minute their work is over, is denied. They also contend that in the light of the wording of the order of Reference, it is not open to the management to contend that they never stopped the workmen from work.

5. The management in their rejoinder say that only 6 out of the 15 workmen engaged by the Contractor were absorbed with effect from 24-4-72 as per their requirements having

regard to their skill, merit and length of employment. They deny that the concerned workmen were in their employment on 1-5-72.

6. On the above pleadings the issues that arise for consideration are—

- (1) Whether there is no employer and employee relationship between the two concerned workmen and the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.
- (2) Whether the management was justified in stopping the concerned workmen from work with effect from September 1972 ?

(3) To what relief ?

7. There is the evidence of one of the workmen Sri S. Vishwakarma (WW-2) and the Contractor Sri S. C. Vishwakarma (WW-1) in support of the workmen's case. For the management the Bonus Clerk (MW-1) and the former Manager of Amlabad Colliery (MW-2) are examined.

8. Issue (1).—Sri S. C. Vishwakarma (WW-1) was engaged on contract by the former management of Amlabad Colliery to attend to Tub repairing and general smithy work about 7 years prior to 24-4-72. He engaged 15 workmen to assist him in this work including the two concerned workmen herein who are his sons. WW-1 says that they (concerned workmen) worked under him continuously for a period of 4 years prior to 24-4-72 when the management did away with the contract system and departmentalised the smithy and Tub repairing work. After 24-4-72, he says, the concerned workmen, himself and the others working under him continued to work as the employees of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. He asserts that after take over the concerned workmen did not work on a casual basis. In his cross-examination he admits that neither he nor the persons working under him were contributing to the Provident Fund. They were not being paid bonus. WW-2 Sri S. Vishwakarma deposed that he and his brother Sri M. N. Vishwakarma worked continuously for 4 years under their father WW-1 prior to 24-4-72. He adds that after 24-4-72 he along with the other workers were taken on the rolls of Bharat Coking Coal Limited and worked regularly till September, 1972 when they were stopped from service.

9. The management has filed the Bonus Register for the year 1972. At pages 236 and 237 of that register (marked as Exts. M-1 & M-2) there are the relevant entries relating to WW-2 and M. M. Vishwakarma, the concerned workmen respectively. They show that for the week ending 29-4-72 to September 1972 they worked in Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., intermittently and for the period they worked they were paid proportionate bonus. MW-1, the Bonus Clerk proves the entries contained in Ext. M-1 and M-2. This bonus register is filed to show that the workmen herein were engaged as casual/badli workers and not on a regular basis.

10. MW-2 is Shri B. Kapoor who worked as Manager of Amlabad Colliery throughout 1972 and till May, 1973. He deposed that after 24-4-72 the two concerned workmen were engaged as Badli/Casual workers for some time. When there was no work for them, their services automatically stood stopped. In his cross-examination he stated that casual and temporary workmen are also on the company's rolls and that they are governed by Company's Standing Orders.

11. On the above evidence it has to be seen whether there is employer and employee relationship between the management and the concerned workmen. As already seen the management in para 9 of their written statement denied the existence of employer and employee relationship between them and the workmen herein. In para 18 (Ibid) they say that they employed the concerned workmen as casual/badli workmen as and when required. In the Bonus register at Exts. M-1 & M-2 their names appear from the week ending 29-3-72. MW-2 did not deny the existence of employer and employee relationship subsequent to 24-4-72. WWs-1 & 2 assert the existence of such a relationship. On the above evidence, I hold Issue (1) for the workmen.

12. Issue (2).—The management contend that the case in question is not one of stoppage of work by them but one of their employment coming to an end. According to them the two workmen herein were casual labourers and the minute

their work on which they were engaged was over their employment came to an automatic end. In such a case, they say notice of termination of service need not be issued. Shri J. D. Lal for the workmen contends that the workmen herein were regular employees and not casual. The entries in the Bonus register Exts. M-1 & M-2 show beyond doubt that the concerned workmen were only casual workers. During the period 24-4-72 to September 1972, they never worked for a week continuously, as can be seen from Exts. M-1 & M-2. One of them worked for 49 days and the other for 50 days during that period. The evidence of the Manager MW-2 is consistent with the entries in Exts. M-1 & M-2. I, therefore hold that the workmen herein were casual workers and not permanent ones.

13. Sri J. D. Lal argues that U/s 17(1) of the Nationalisation Act, 36 of 1972 all the employees who were on the rolls of the company on the appointed day, automatically became permanent employees of the new Company. There is no warrant for this contention. This Section lays down that the employees who were on the rolls on the appointed day would continue to serve the company on the same terms and conditions as before. If the concerned workmen were casual workers on the appointed day they will continue to be so even after nationalisation. In this view of the matter, I hold that even after 1-5-72 the date of nationalisation, the workmen enjoyed the same status of casual workers and that the management would be justified in stopping them from work if they found that they were rendered surplus.

14. The main submission of Shri Lal is that the concerned workmen were discriminated against by the management in being stopped from work. It is not disputed that the Contractor WW-1 was engaging 15 workers to assist him in his work including the two concerned workmen herein. The case of the union that with the exception of the two concerned workmen the rest of them were absorbed in the company's service on a permanent basis cannot be believed. MW-1 the Manager says only 5 or 6 of them were so absorbed and that the rest including the two workmen herein were considered to be surplus. Ext. M-3 the Office Order dated 7-5-73 shows that only 5 workmen including the Contractor WW-1 were absorbed on a regular basis from the respective dates specified therein. In the absence of any other reliable evidence, it is not safe to accept the mere assertion of WWs-1 & 2 at this point. It has to be held that the Contractor WW-1 and 4 other former workmen of his were taken on a regular basis and the others stopped.

15. The contention of the management is that the concerned workmen herein being casual workers, they cannot have any legal claim to question the action of the management in not engaging them after September 1972. I do not agree. From paras 16 & 17 of the management's written statement and para 3 of their rejoinder, it appears that they did not regularise the services of some of the workmen on a casual basis according to their whims and fancies, but on the basis of their needs, suitability and job performance. It is also said that the two concerned workmen were not in the employment of WW-1 for sufficiently long to merit any consideration. In para 3 of their rejoinder they say that only 6 out of the 15 engaged by WW-1, the contractor were absorbed as per their requirement in accordance with their skill, merit and length of employment. MW-2, the Manager has deposed that has deposited that based on the recommendation of the Contractor regarding seniority and merit 6 of the workmen have been absorbed. WW-1 the Contractor has deposed that as per the notice Ext. M-4, he was asked to hand over charge of all material jobs, implements and records to the Project Engineer and that he had complied with that direction. He was asked in his cross-examination whether he had obtained any receipt for the documents handed over by him to the Company. He replied he did not. MW-2, the Manager also stated that the Contractor complied with the direction given in Ex. M-4 by handing over a list of all the workmen engaged by him. The management has not filed any record whatsoever to show the basis on which they regularised the employment of only 5 of the persons engaged by the former contractor WW-1. Shri J. D. Lal submits that if the concerned two workmen herein were casual labourers, so were the 5 workers who were regularised as per Ext. M-3. He submits that in the absence of any reliable evidence to show that the two concerned workmen were inferior in skill merit and also served for a shorter period than the 5 regularised employees, the management's action in not providing work

to the concerned workmen herein can not be justified. There is good deal of force in this contention. In the absence of any evidence to show that the 5 regularised employees had greater length of service and better skill and ability, the action of the management in dispensing with the services of the two concerned workmen may be called arbitrary. Issue (2) held against the management.

16. The management submits that there is inordinate delay of 4 years on the part of the workmen in raising the present dispute and therefore this reference should be rejected, for that reason alone. I do not agree. The workmen pray for back wages. On the date they were stopped from work they were casual Mazdoors in Category I. Their claim for back wages may not arise because they were only casual workers without any guarantee of continued employment for all the 26 days in a month. There is no evidence on record to show that they were gainfully employed from the date they were stopped from work till the date of the hearing of this case.

17. In my view the ends of justice will be amply met if the management is called upon to reinstate the workmen herein on the rolls of the company on the same terms and conditions as they were enjoying prior to the date of their being stopped from work in September, 1972.

18. In the result this Reference is answered as follows :

The management is not justified in stopping the two concerned workmen from work with effect from September '72. The management is directed to reinstate them in service on the same terms and conditions as they were enjoying prior to the date of their being stopped from service within one month from the date of this Award.

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012/160/77-D. III (A)]

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1980

S.O. 743.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kustore, District Dhanbad and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 6 of 1979

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012/167/78-D.III(A)
Dt. 15-1-1979)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.L., P.O. Kustore, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri N. Nag, President, Akhil Bharatiya Shosit Mazdoor Sangh.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 29th February, 1980

AWARD

The short facts giving rise to this case may briefly be stated thus. One Sri Bishambhar Singh is alleged to have been working in the Workshop of Kustore Colliery since 1966. He claims to be performing the job of an Armature Winder even though he is called a General Mazdoor. Inspite of this he used to be paid the wages of an Armature Winder by the then management. This was the state of affairs before the colliery was taken over. After nationalisation the case of the workman is that even though he continued to work in the Workshop as Armature Winder he was wrongly designated as Armature Winder Helper and was put under Cat. IV. He was promoted as an Armature Winder Grade II, was placed in this state of things continued upto 18-8-78 when the workman was promoted as Armature Winder Grade II, was placed in Cat. V and was paid the wages admissible to Armature Winder Grade II in Cat. V. For the wrong categorisation since the date of take over of the colliery by the Government and for non-payment of wages admissible to an Armature Winder since the date of take over he made representations to the management praying for putting him in the category of an Armature Winder Grade I under Cat. VI. Representations made by him not having yielded any result a dispute was raised over his claim through the union, namely, Akhil Bhartiya Shosit Mazdoor Sangh. There was a conciliation proceeding relating to the dispute which having ended in failure the appropriate Government made the reference to this Tribunal in the following terms :—

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Kustore Colliery of Messrs. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kustore, District Dhanbad for placing Shri Bishambhar Singh in Category-VI with effect from the 17th October, 1971 is justified ? If so, to what relief is the said workmen entitled ?"

2. After notice to the parties the union representing the workmen filed its written statement alleging the facts already enumerated in paragraph above preceding. The management filed written statement raising various technical points that the sponsoring union had no locus standi or competency to raise the dispute; that the Union had no existence in the Kustore Colliery; that the sponsoring union had never been authorised to raise any dispute; that Sri Bishambhar Singh was never a member of the concerned union; that the union never demanded category-VI for Shri Bishambhar Singh from 17-10-71; that the reference of the dispute covering the period prior to vesting of the colliery in B.C.C.L. was beyond the competence of the Central Government; that B.C.C.L. was not in existence on 17-10-71 from which date relief was claimed by the workman concerned; that in view of Sec. 9 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972, there could be no reference relating to any action of the old management by custodian; that the colliery in question having vested in the B.C.C.L. free from all encumbrances could not be held responsible for events happening prior to the vesting and that the reference was otherwise not competent. These grounds taken by the management in its written statement have not been pressed at the time of the hearing. With regard to the factual aspect of the case it is said by the management that as per records, on the date of take over of the management of Kustore Colliery on 17-10-71, Sri Bishambhar Singh was only a General Mazdoor in Cat. I. After take over as he was found to be better equipped than a General Mazdoor he was appointed as an Armature Winder Helper Cat. IV with effect from 19-10-71. For these reasons when Sri B. Singh made a representation for higher category he was told by the management that he would be given higher category provided he worked actually as an Armature Winder. It is further pleaded that when Sri B. Singh actually started to work as Armature Winder his case was put up before the Departmental Promotion Committee for promotion alongwith other eligible candidates. The Departmental Promotion Committee recommended that Sri B. Singh should be promoted to Armature Winder Grade II and should be placed in Cat. V. This recommendation was given effect to and Sri B. Singh was promoted to the post of Armature Winder Grade II and placed in Cat. V since 18-8-78. The further case of the management is that the Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry cate-

gorised Armature Winders both in Cat. V and VI based on skill and experience. The job description of these two categories in Coal Wage Board recommendation are as follows:

CATEGORY-V (SKILLED SENIOR)	CATEGORY-VI (HIGHLY SKILLED)
ARMATURE WINDER : Gr. II (W)	ARMATURE WINDER : Gr. I (W)

According to the management as Sri B. Singh was found to be a skilled workman not having necessary experience and was in need of some guidance or supervision he was placed in Cat. V. An Armature Winder in Cat. VI is not only a higher skilled workman but is capable of working independently. Sri B. Singh not having the required experience to work independently he was placed in Cat. V as Armature Winder Grade II. He would be considered for promotion to the next higher category when there would be vacancy for the same while considering his case for promotion if he would be found fit he would be duly promoted to Cat. VI.

3.8 It is an admitted position that the colliery in question where Sri B. Singh claims to be working since 1966 was under private management till 17-10-71, when it was taken over by the Government and was put incharge of a custodian. The custodian managed the colliery till the same was nationalised and vested in B.C.C.L. on 1-5-72.

It is also not in dispute that the Central Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry submitted its report in the year 1967 which as per the decision of the Government came into effect from 15-8-67. Under the report various workers working in coal mining industry have been categorised under six categories. According to the report Armature Winders have been placed under categories V and VI. Those in Cat. V are known as Armature Winder Grade II and those in Cat. VI are known as Armature Winder Grade I. An Armature Winder of Cat. V is less skilled and is not capable to work independently whereas an Armature Winder in Cat. VI is a higher skilled worker capable to work independently. In para 17 of Chapter VIII of the Report it has been clearly mentioned that besides the broad six categories mentioned above there are other workers who have not been included in any of the categories. With regard to these workers the recommendation is that they should be fitted to any one of the six categories recommended in the report by mutual negotiation between the parties.

4. Management contents that before nationalisation the workman concerned was working in the colliery as General Mazdoor. He was not working as an Armature Winder. Custodian took over the management on 17-10-71. At that time as the custodian found that the work of the workman concerned was of better type than that of a General Mazdoor, he (custodian) designated the post which Sri B. Singh was holding as the post of an Armature Winder Helper and put Sri Singh in Cat. IV. The workman concerned never objected to this and accepted the position. According to the recommendation of the Wage Board there was no prohibition for the management to put any workman not covered under any of the six broad categories mentioned in the report, in any of those categories according to suitability after negotiation. The fact that the custodian put the workman concerned into Cat. IV after designating the post he was holding as Armature Winder Helper having been accepted by the workman it should be held that he (workman concerned) was validly categorised as belonging to Cat. IV in accordance with the recommendation of the Wage Board. It is further contended by the management that since take over on 17-10-71

the workman concerned continued to work as Armature Winder Helper in Cat. IV till he was duly promoted by the management to the post of Armature Winder Grade II Cat. V on 18-8-78 on the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee. The workman would be considered for the further promotion to Grade I under Cat. VI when a vacancy would arise and if at that time he would be found fit he would be promoted to Grade VI.

The contention of the workman is that from the very beginning i.e. 1966 he has been working as Armature Winder in the colliery. The private management which was managing the colliery till 17-10-71 had wrongly put him in the class of General Mazdoor. But inspite of this the workman claims that he was getting the wages of an Armature Winder. After take over on 17-10-71 the custodian should have put the worker in Cat. VI. Instead of doing that he (custodian) wrongly designated the post of the workman concerned as that of an Armature Winder Helper and put him in Cat. IV even though as a matter of fact the workman was actually working as an Armature Winder and was entitled to be put in Cat. VI. It is on account of this wrong placement workman concerned made several representations to the management which not having borne any fruit the workman was compelled to raise the industrial dispute through the union concerned.

5. From the contentions of the parties the first question which falls for determination is as to whether the workman concerned was working as an Armature Winder till 17-10-71 even though placed in the class of General Mazdoor. On this point there is no evidence on the side of the management. On the side of the workmen, there is nothing except the bare assertion of the workman himself. No other co-worker has been examined in support of the case of the workman nor any documentary evidence has been produced by the workman that he was actually working as an Armature Winder and was being paid as such under private management. In these circumstances it is not possible to accept the case of the workman that he was actually working as an Armature Winder under private management and was being paid as such even though placed in class of General Mazdoor. Next question which calls for a decision is as to whether from 17-10-71 till 18-8-78 the workman was actually doing the work of an Armature Winder though wrongly designated as an Armature Winder Helper being put in Cat. IV. On this point there is no evidence on the side of the workman except his own assertion. On the side of the management two witnesses have been examined. MW-1 is an Executive Engineer working in Kustore Workshop from April 1977. He says that he knows the workman concerned. According to him since the time he took charge in 1977 he had seen the workman concerned working in the Workshop as an Armature Winder Helper and not as an Armature Winder. MW-1 further asserts that the workman was promoted as Armature Winder Grade II in Cat. IV on 18-8-78. The witness claims to have watched the performance of the workman and according to him the workman cannot work as an Armature Winder independently. The witness further asserts that prior to promotion on 18-8-78 the workman was working as Helper to Rameshwar Pandit, Bhujanga Baxi and others. To establish the case as deposited to by the MW-1 the management has examined MW-2, Dy. Personnel Manager in Kustore Colliery. He has produced the Attendance Register of the Workshop concerned for the year 1972. The page in the Register covering the period from 15-2-72 to 21-10-72 shows that Sri B. Singh had attended Workshop and was working as Armature Winder Helper. The other pages of the register also show the same thing. The register is Ext. M-4. The witness has also produced another Attendance Register Ext. M-4 which shows that Sri B. Singh was working as Armature Winder Helper in Cat. IV. The relevant entries in the two registers showing that Sri B. Singh was working as an Armature Winder Helper have been marked as exhibits. Neither the genuineness of the entries in these two registers is challenged by the workman nor it is said that the two registers have been manipulated by the management for the purpose of defeating the workman's claim. After having gone through the evidence of the two witnesses, namely, MW-1 and MW-2 and scrutinising the documentary evidence produced on behalf of the management I have no hesitation to come to the conclusion that since the time of take over i.e. from 17-10-71 the workman concerned was put in Cat. IV and the post he was holding was designated as Armature Winder Helper till the workman was promoted to the category of Armature Winder Grade II in Cat. V on 18-8-78. Merely because in Cat. IV the Wage Board

have not put any helper it cannot be said that the management had no power to put the workman in the category. The contention of the workman that the management was not justified in designating the post the workman was holding as the post of an Armature Winder Helper and in putting him in Cat. IV is without any force. Because as per the report of the Wage Board several workers working in different coal mines who could not be placed in any of the six categories mentioned in the report could after discussion be fitted in any of the six categories. In other words according to the recommendation of the Wages Board any workman not included in any of those categories mentioned in the report could be placed in any of those six categories after mutual discussion between the parties. As has been noticed earlier since 17-10-71 management designated the post held by Sri Singh as the post of an Armature Winder Helper and put him in Cat. IV. This was not objected to by the workman who acquiesced in the position implying his consent. This continued till the colliery vested in B.C.C.L. on 1-5-72. Under Sec. 17 of Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, B.C.C.L. was bound to allow the workmen to continue as an Armature Winder Helper Cat. IV till he was promoted on 18-8-78. The workman, however, comes forward with the case that he was actually doing the work of an Armature Winder before nationalisation and continued to work as such till the date of his promotion to the post of Armature Winder Grade II in Cat. IV on 18-8-78 by the management. Had this case of the workman been accepted certainly the workman would have been entitled to the relief claimed. But as this case of the workman has not been established on account of absence of any evidence worthy of credit and the management's case has been accepted being supported by both oral and documentary evidence of unimpeachable character the case of the workman has to be dismissed as not proved. The evidence of Executive Engineer of the Workshop concerned and the documentary evidence borne out by the two Attendance Registers point to the conclusion that the workman was not doing the work of an Armature Winder but was doing the work of an Armature Winder Helper before he was promoted. I have already held that there was no bar for the management to put the workman concerned in Cat. IV and to designate the post he was holding as the post of an Armature Winder Helper as such a thing is permissible under the recommendation of the Wage Board. Therefore It is futile to contend that the management committed a mistake in designating the post the workman was holding on the date of take over as the post of an Armature Winder Helper and in placing him in Cat. IV. The Wage Board recommendation do not put an Armature Winder Helper in any of the six categories recommended in the report. As such management was free to put the workman in Cat. IV by designating the post he was holding as the post of an Armature Winder Helper.

6. For the reasons stated above I hold that the workman concerned is not entitled to hold the post of Armature Winder in Cat. VI. It is not in dispute that the worker concerned is now holding the post of Armature Winder Grade II and has been placed in Cat. V after his promotion on 18-8-78. The management concedes that when a vacancy arises in Cat. VI the case of the workman concerned would be considered for promotion and that if at that time the workman would be found fit he would be promoted to the post of Armature Winder Grade I in Cat. VI. The workman is, therefore, entitled to no relief. The reference is answered accordingly.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012/167/78-D.III(A)]

New Delhi, the 13th March, 1980

S.O. 744.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Central Coalfields Limited, Post Office Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh (Bihar) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th March, 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri P. Ramakrishna, Presiding Officer

Reference No. 37 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh (Bihar).

AND

Their workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri T. P. Chowdhury, Advocate.

For the Workman—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : Bihar

Dated, the 23rd February, 1980

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication as per their Order No. L-20012/235/77-DIII(A), dated 29th April, 1978.

Schedule

"Whether the action of the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Central Coalfields Limited, P.O. Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh (Bihar) in dismissing Shri Baleshwar Singh, Haulage Engine Driver from service with effect from 13th September, 1976, is justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?".

2. The Secretary, United Coal Workers Union has filed a written statement of claim on behalf of the workman herein stating that the workman herein was a Haulage Engine Driver in September, 1976. On 4th June, 1976 Maheshwar Singh an employee of Sounda 'D' Colliery was taking his sick child to the Bhurkunda Hospital. The workman concerned accompanied the said Maheshwar Singh to the residence of Dr. D. L. Kundu the Medical Officer at about 7.50 p.m. Dr. Kundu examined the child and directed him to be admitted as an indoor patient for treatment. Unfortunately the child expired by mid-night. Maheshwar Singh and the workman herein felt that for want of prompt attention at the hospital the child had died. So they caught hold of Dr. Kundu and beat him. For this offence the workman herein was tried at a domestic enquiry and found guilty. The competent authority to whom the finding was submitted agreed with the view taken by the Enquiry Officer and imposed the punishment of dismissal from service. The workman complains that the domestic enquiry is vitiated by the failure on the part of the Enquiry Officer to observe the principles of natural justice. It is also submitted that when the workman was charged with the offence of assault the Enquiry Officer should have recorded a finding of not guilty when once he held on the evidence that it was Maheshwar Singh that actually hit the Doctor with a shoe and not he (the workman). They also say that the workman has a long and unblemished record of service and the punishment of dismissal imposed on him is disproportionate to the offence committed by him.

3. The management in their written statement submitted that the enquiry was fair and proper and that the findings of the Enquiry Officer were based on evidence. They say that having regard to the unruly and riotous behaviour of the workman and his relation Maheshwar Singh the punishment of dismissal cannot be said to be unjustified.

4. The management in their rejoinder denied the averment that there is any negligence on the part of the Doctor or his staff in attending to the sick child. They reiterate that the conduct of the workman herein justified the punishment imposed on him.

5. The workman has not chosen to file any rejoinder.

6. For the reasons given in the Order dated 29th December, 1979 this Court held that the enquiry in question was fair and proper. The only other points that remain to be considered are —

(1) Whether the finding of guilty recorded by the Enquiry Officer is justified and valid?

(2) Whether the punishment imposed on the workman is disproportionate to the offence proved?

7. Point (1).—The workman herein and his relation Maheshwar Singh were charged for the offence of assaulting the Medical Officer Dr. Kundu. They were tried separately for the said offence. Before the Enquiry Officer the complainant viz. Dr. Kundu and the workman were examined. The Doctor deposed that when the workman herein caught hold of him by his shoulder, his relation Maheshwar Singh hit him with a shoe. The Enquiry Officer accepted this evidence and on that basis held the workman herein guilty. It is argued that the workman was charged for one offence viz. Assault and found guilty of another offence viz. Catching hold of the Doctor firmly to enable his relation to beat him (Doctor) with a shoe and this has caused great prejudice to the delinquent. It is said that the charge sheet should have disclosed the exact role played by the delinquent and since it is not done in this case, the enquiry should be held to be vitiated. I do not agree. He knew that he was being tried for assaulting the Doctor on the night in question along with Maheshwar Singh. His statement and the cross-examination of the Doctor clearly indicated this. The two persons in question are tried for the offence of assault. Whether one beats the victim while the other catches hold of him firmly or both of them beat the victim, the result is the same in the eye of law. They jointly participated in the crime sharing the common intention of assaulting the Doctor. Both of them are liable to be convicted of the offence of assault, which is done.

8. I also hold that the finding of guilty recorded by the Enquiry Officer is based on proper evidence. Point (1) held against the workmen.

9. Point (2).—Regarding the other point viz. the punishment being disproportionate to the offence established, from the statement of the workman before the Enquiry Officer it appears that he and Maheshwar Singh took the latter's child to Dr. Kundu's residence at about 6 p.m. on 4th June, 1976. When he requested the Doctor to examine the child the Doctor declined to do so. The repeated entreaties of the workman and his friend Parameshwar Singh did not have any effect on the Doctor. After keeping them waiting for about an hour the Doctor gave a slip and asked them to take the patient to the indoor ward. Inside the ward there were no medicines. The Doctor prescribed certain medicines and directed them to purchase them from outside. In the meanwhile Oxygen was given to the child. The medicines purchased from the market were also administered. As the condition of the child was fast deteriorating the staff sent for Doctor Kundu but he did not oblige. The Ward Boy was again sent to bring Dr. Kundu. By the time he arrived at the hospital the child had expired. It is said that he did not even care to see the dead body of the child. The delinquent further says that he requested Dr. Kundu to pronounce the child to be dead or alive. Even then the Doctor did not go to see the child. Sometime later the Doctor asked them to go away taking the dead body of the child from the verandah. The Doctor's version is that soon after the child was taken before him he directed the Sister to admit it as an indoor patient. He says that he, the Lady Doctor and the Nurse did their best to save the child. By about 11.55 p.m. the Ward Boy came to call him to the hospital. He at once went to the patient's bed and found the child dead. He says after seeing the dead body of the child he was sitting in the Sister's room where he was assaulted by the workman herein and Maheshwar Singh. He says that

while the workman herein caught hold of him Maheshwar Singh hit him with shoes three or four times. He denied the suggestion that he called upon the workman herein and Maheshwar Singh to purchase medicines from outside.

10. On the above evidence it has to be seen whether there are any extenuating circumstances in favour of the workman. There cannot be any two opinions regarding the conduct of the workman which is most reprehensible and subversive of discipline. Still it has to be considered whether the extreme punishment of dismissal is warranted. In judging the conduct of the workman his social background may also be taken into account. He is a rough miner. When the precious life of the child was lost, they could not control themselves and behaved in the manner they did. I feel that reinstatement in service without back wages and without any further increments from the date of dismissal from service viz. 13th September, 1976 till the date of reinstatement will be adequate punishment.

11. For the aforesaid reasons the Reference is answered as follows :—

(1) The action of the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd., in dismissing the concerned workman from service with effect from 13th September, 1976 is not justified.

(2) He is directed to be reinstated in service with effect from 13th September, 1976 with continuity of service, but without the benefit of arrears of wages or increments from 13th September, 1976 till the date of reinstatement.

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012/235/77-D-III(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 1980

का० प्रा० 745.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 16(1) के अनुसरण में, डा० पी० एस० चरनालिया के स्थान पर श्री हरमेन्द्र सिंह, प्रा० ए० एस० को 10 मार्च, 1980 के पूर्वान्त से भाग्यमी भावेन्द्र जारी होने तक महानिवेशक, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा नियम के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12026/3/79-ए०प्रा०]

एस० एस० सहभानामन, उप-सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1980

S.O. 745.—In pursuance of section 16(1) of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government appoints Shri Har Mander Singh, I.A.S. as Director General Employees' State Insurance Corporation, with effect from the forenoon of the 10th March, 1980, until further orders vide Dr. V. M. Charnalia.

[No. A-12026/3/79-HI]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1980

का० प्रा० 746.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त गतियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय की प्रधिसूचना संघर्ष का०प्रा० 527, दिनांक 22 जनवरी, 1979 के क्रम में, हिन्दुस्तान लिपियाँ लिमिटेड, विशाखापत्नम् को पहली मंगल, 1979 से 31 मार्च, 1980 तक, जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, की भी भवधि के लिए उक्त प्रधिनियम के प्रबलन से छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोत्तम की बारे में निम्नलिखित है, प्रश्नतः—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, इस प्रबंधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त प्रधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसके पालनात् उक्त प्रबंधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियाँ, ऐसे प्राप्त में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के प्रधीन उसे उक्त प्रबंधि की बाबत देनी ची;

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की आरा 45 की उपचारा (1) के प्रधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस लिमिट प्राधिकृत कोई भूम्य पत्रारी—

(i) आरा 44 की उपचारा (1) के प्रधीन, उक्त प्रबंधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरणी की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या

(ii) यह प्रभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा घोषित रजिस्टर और घोषित, उक्त प्रबंधि के लिए रखे गये थे या नहीं; या

(iii) यह प्रभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस प्रधिनियम के प्रधीन छूट थी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हक्कावार बना हुआ है, या नहीं; या

(iv) यह प्रभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस प्रबंधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में प्रधिनियम के उपलब्ध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपलब्धों का प्रतुपालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये सक्षम होगा :—

(क) प्रधान या प्रब्लेम्हित नियोजक से घोषका करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पत्रारी आवश्यक समझता है; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या प्रब्लेम्हित नियोजक के प्रधियोगात्मीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रधानी से यह घोषका करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और भजदूरी के संबंध से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, अहिया और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदशारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें, या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या प्रब्लेम्हित नियोजक को, उसके प्रधिकर्ता या सेवक को ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की ओं ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदशारी के पास यह विषावास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

स्वाक्षर्यात्मक लाप्त

इस मामले में पूर्वपिण्डी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई है क्योंकि छूट के लिए ग्रातं आवेदन-पत्र की कार्रवाई पर समय लगा। तथापि, यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वपिण्डी प्रभाव से छूट देने से किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

[संख्या एस-38014/47/78-एच-पाई]

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1980

S.O. 746.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 527, dated the 22nd January, 1979, the Central Government hereby exempts Hindustan Shipyard Limited, Visakhapatnam from the operation of the said Act for a further period with effect from 1st April, 1979 upto and inclusive of 31st March, 1980.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act, or other Official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

(i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or

(ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or

(iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or

(iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory;

be empowered to—

(a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or

(b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or

(c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises, or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

Explanatory Memorandum

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case, as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

[No. S-38014/47/78-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 13 मार्च, 1980

का० प्रा० 747.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कमेंटारी भवित्व निपि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 5-क की उपस्थाग (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुये, (1) श्री बी०ए० भट्टाचार्य उप सचिव, भारत सरकार इस्पात विभाग और (2) श्री पी० अट्टमल शर्व, महासचिव, अधिकार भारतीय नियोजक महासंघ, फैडरेशन इंडिया, नई दिल्ली के स्थान पर अधिकार (1) श्री बाई०ए० राजबाई, निदेशक इस्पात विभाग भारत सरकार नई दिल्ली और (2) श्री बी०ए० सेठी, सचिव, अधिकार भारतीय नियोजक महासंघ, फैडरेशन इंडिया, नानमेन मार्ग, नई दिल्ली को केन्द्रीय चारों ओर का सरकार नियुक्त करती है और भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2 खण्ड 3(ii) तारीख 10 जनवरी, 1976 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के थ्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का०प्रा० 236, तारीख 16 दिसम्बर, 1975 में निम्नलिखित रूपोंधन और करती है, अधिकृतः—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम संख्या 6 और 22 के मामले स्थान 2 में क्रमशः निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जायेंगी, अधिकृतः—

5. श्री बाई०ए० राजबाई, निदेशक, इस्पात, आन और कोथला मंत्रालय (इस्पात विभाग) भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली।
22. श्री बी०ए० सेठी, सचिव, अधिकार भारतीय नियोजक महासंघ, फैडरेशन इंडिया, नानमेन मार्ग, नई दिल्ली।

[सं० बी०-20012/1/75-भ०नि०-2]
हमराज छाबड़ा, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th March, 1980

S.O. 747.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5A of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints (1) Shri Y. L. Rajwade, Director, Department of Steel, Government of India, New Delhi and (2) Shri B. M. Sethi, Secretary, All India Organisation of Employers, Federation House, Tansen Marg, New Delhi, as members of the Central Board of Trustees, vice (1) Shri B. S. Bhattacharya, Deputy Secretary, Department of Steel; and (2) Shri P. Chentsal Rao, Secretary General All India Organisation of Employers, Federation House, New Delhi respectively and makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour number S.O. 236, dated the 16th December, 1975 published in part II, section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 10th January, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification for the entries in column 2 against serial numbers 6 and 22, for the entries, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

- (6) "Shri Y. L. Rajwade, Director, Department of Steel, Ministry of Steel, Mines and Coal, Government of India, New Delhi."
- (22) "Shri B. M. Sethi, Secretary, All India Organisation of Employers, Federation House, Tansen Marg, New Delhi."

[No. V. 20012(1)/75-PF.II]

HANS RAJ CHHABRA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 13th March, 1980

S.O. 748.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Bhadra, Ahmedabad and their workmen over termination of services of Shri Ramesh G. Barot, Farrash-cum-Messenger with effect from 5th March, 1977 which was received by the Central Government on 26th February, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI R. C. ISRANI, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AHMEDABAD

(Reference (ITC) No. 3 of 1979)

Adjudication

BETWEEN

The State Bank of India, Bhadra, Ahmedabad,

AND

Their Workmen

In the matter of the Workmen's demand regarding the termination of the services of Shri Ramesh G. Barot, Farrash-cum-Messenger —

APPEARANCES :

Shri N. Y. Oza, Law Officer, State Bank of India,—for the Bank.

Shri J. M. Brait, Under Secretary, State Bank of India & Subsidiary Banks' Employees' Union, Ahmedabad Sub-Office,—for the Workmen.

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Govt. of India to this Industrial Tribunal under the provisions of section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (hereinafter to be referred to as 'the Act'), vide Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour's Order No. I-12012/82/78-D.IIA, dated the 7th March, 1979, in respect of an industrial dispute, which has arisen between the State Bank of India, Ahmedabad, (hereinafter to be referred to as 'the bank'), and the Workmen employed under it.

2. The industrial dispute, as it appears from the schedule attached to the original order, under which this reference has been made, relates to the demand, which is as under:—

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, L.H.O., Bhadra, Ahmedabad in terminating the services of Shri Ramesh G. Barot, Farrash-cum-Messenger with effect from 5th March, 1977 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

3. In support of the above mentioned demand, the concerned workman, Shri Ramesh G. Barot, (hereinafter to be referred to as 'the workman'), has filed his statement of claim, (Ex. 2), on 27th April, 1979. It is the case of the workman, as disclosed from that statement of claim, that he was appointed as a farrash-cum-messenger in the service of the bank with effect from 1st May, 1976. It is his grievance that without giving him any previous notice and without assigning any reasons, the bank was terminating his services at different intervals only with a view to seeing that he did not put in continuous service under the bank. He has disclosed through this statement of claim that on about six different occasions his services were terminated and artificial breaks were introduced in his otherwise continuous service under the bank. It is his case that, in fact, there was neither any reason, nor any justification, for terminating his services on those different occasions, but those actions were taken by the authorities of the bank in order to see that he did not complete a continuous service of more than 12 months under the bank. His further grievance is that while effecting those artificial breaks in his otherwise continuous service by terminating his service on different occasions, the bank had violated the mandatory provisions of Shastri Award, which governs the conditions of service of the workmen of different categories employed by the bank. According to the workman, for the last time his services were terminated through an oral order on 5-3-1977 and even the said order was illegal and also void ab initio, because it was made in direct violation of the provisions of Shastri Award, as well as in direct contravention of the provisions of Section 25B and 25F of the Act. It is the explanation of the workman that the bank authorities were consistently approached to revise their action and to reinstate him in his original position, but they did not pay any heed. Because of this attitude on the part of the authorities of the bank, the workman raised an industrial dispute before

the conciliation authorities, of the Central Government. It is his allegation that even before those authorities, the bank officers did not co-operate, with the result that the conciliation proceedings failed and it was thereafter that the Government of India was pleased to make this reference to this Industrial Tribunal for the adjudication of the same. It was finally prayed through this statement of claim that this Industrial Tribunal may declare that the said action of the bank, in terminating the services of the workman through the oral order with effect from 5-3-1977, be declared to be illegal. It is also prayed that a direction be given to the bank to reinstate the workman in his original position with continuity of service and also for the payment of his full back wages.

4. On behalf of the bank, the written statement, (Ex. 3), has been filed on 29-5-1979. It is contended on behalf of the bank that this reference is not legally tenable and that the dispute covered by this reference, is not an industrial dispute as contemplated under Section 2(k) of the Act. As regards the employment of the workman and the termination of his service on different occasions, as disclosed through the statement of claim, (Ex. 2), the bank has not disputed them. However, it is explained that it was always at the end of contractual period for which the workman was temporarily employed that his services used to be terminated. It was explained that there were no mala fides on the part of the bank in terminating his services at different occasions, but those actions were necessitated on account of the fact that his services were no more required, as he was appointed only temporarily for specific periods. It was claimed through this written statement that whenever temporary appointment was given to the workman, his services used to be terminated at the end of the period for which he was specifically appointed.

5. As regards the allegation of breach of the provisions of the Shastri Award, it was explained that the bank had not committed any such breach, as in the case of the workman, it was not necessary to give him any notice as contemplated under that award before terminating his services, because his services were not terminated before the expiry of the period for which he was specifically and temporarily appointed. As regards the contention of the workman through his statement of claim regarding the contravention of the provisions of Section 25B and 25F of the Act, it was also contended by the bank that even those provisions cannot be attracted in this case, because the workman had not been in the continuous service of the bank for not less than one year. According to the bank, the termination of service of the workman with effect from 5th March, 1977, would not amount to retrenchment as contemplated under Section 2(oo) of the Act and, therefore, any plea raised on behalf of the workman based on those provisions of the Act, would not be available to him. It was, therefore, urged that the demand covered by this reference, cannot be granted and the reference be, therefore, rejected.

6. When this reference was taken up for consideration, the workman was represented by one Shri J. M. Brait, the Under Secretary, Bank of India & Subsidiary Banks Employees' Union, Ahmedabad, (hereinafter to be referred to as 'the union'). He was given the authority in writing by the workman, which is produced at Ex. 4/1. The bank was represented by their Law Officer, Shri N. Y. Oza. On behalf of the workman, there is only his own evidence, which has been recorded at Ex. 6. Thereafter, the case of the workman was closed through the purshis (Ex. 9), dated 25th September, 1979. As regards the bank, no oral evidence was led, and in that connection the purshis, (Ex. 11), was filed on 25th September, 1979. However, on behalf of the parties some documentary evidence has been produced, which has been exhibited with their mutual consent.

7. After hearing the learned representatives of the parties, and after considering the oral, as well as the documentary evidence in this reference, it will have to be found out as to whether the action of the bank in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5th March, 1977, can be legally justified ?

8. Before entering into a detailed discussion in respect of the above mentioned point, it will be necessary to give in a tabular form the various dates on which the workman was given appointment under the bank and on which his services were terminated. These admitted details find support both

from the statement of claim, (Ex. 2), filed on behalf of the workman as from the written statement, (Ex. 3), filed on behalf of the bank. Not only that, but they also find support from a document produced by the bank itself, which is dated 25th September, 1979, and is admitted at Ex. 10/1. Those details are as under :—

Date of Appointment Date of Termination

(i) 1st May, 1976	26th June, 1976.
(ii) 2nd July, 1976.	26th July, 1976.
(iii) 28th July, 1976.	31st July, 1976.
(iv) 1st August, 1976.	29th September, 1976.
(v) 1st October, 1976.	30th October, 1976.
(vi) 1st November, 1976.	31st December, 1976.
(vii) 6th January, 1977.	5th March, 1977.

9. During the above mentioned period of his employment, which was intermittent, he had actually worked for 296 days, according to the union, and even the bank has admitted that position through its written statement, (Ex. 3), in para (4), while giving the details regarding the different periods during which the workman had worked actually in the service of the bank. It is thus fully established that during the period from 1st May, 1976, to 5th March, 1977, the workman had actually worked for 296 days. In this connection, it will be necessary, in the first instance, to examine the contention of the workman that the termination of his service with effect from 5th March, 1977, was illegal as it was in contravention of the provisions of Section 25B and 25F of the Act. In my opinion, the said provisions of the Act cannot be legally attracted in this case, because even though the workman had actually worked for more than 240 days during that period, yet his entire employment under the bank was not for one year. It was, on the contrary, for a period which was less than one year. His first appointment was on 1st May, 1976, and his services were terminated on 5th March, 1977. In this connection, there is a direct decision of the Supreme Court of India, reported in 1963, (II), LLJ, at p. 367, in the case between Sur Enamel and Stamping Works Ltd., and their workmen. In that case also, the Supreme Court was considered the application of Sections 25B and 25F of the Act. The relevant observations are on page 370, and they are as under :—

"Coming now to the case of Nagen Bora and Monoharan, we find that they were temporary workmen. The tribunal held that the order of termination of their services was bad only by reason of non-compliance with the provisions of S. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act and not otherwise. The tribunal directed certain payments to be made to these persons by way of compensation. Mr. Sen Gupta wanted to argue that as these two were temporary workmen they were not entitled to the benefit of S. 25F. It is unnecessary for us to consider this question as it appears to us that assuming that temporary workmen are also entitled to the benefit of S. 25F, neither Nagen Bora nor Monoharan comes within the terms of that section.

On the plain terms of the section only a workman who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer is entitled to its benefit. "Continuous service" is defined in S. 2(ee) as meaning uninterrupted service, and includes service which may be interrupted merely on account of sickness or authorized leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal or a lockout or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman. What is meant by "one year of continuous service" has been defined in S. 25B. Under this section a workman who during a period of twelve calendar months has actually worked in an industry for not less than 240 days shall be deemed to have completed one year of completed service in the industry. Nagen Bora and Monoharan were both re-appointed on 10th March, 1959. Their services were terminated on 15th January, 1960. Thus their total period of employment was less than eleven months. It is not disputed that period of their former employment under the company prior to their reappointment on 10th March, 1959 cannot be taken into consideration in computing the period of one year,

because it is common ground that their reappointment on 10th March, 1959 was a fresh appointment. The position therefore is that during a period of employment for less than eleven calendar months these two persons worked for more than 240 days. In our opinion, that would not satisfy the requirement of S. 25B. Before a workman can be considered to have completed one year of continuous service in an industry it must be shown first that he was employed for a period of not less than twelve calendar months and, next that during those twelve calendar months he had worked for not less than 240 days. Where, as in the present case, the workmen have not at all been employed for a period of twelve calendar months it becomes unnecessary to examine whether the actual days of work numbered 240 days or more. For, in any case, the requirements of S. 25B would not be satisfied by the mere fact of the number of working days being not less than 240 days.

We have therefore come to the conclusion that the tribunal was wrong in thinking that these two workmen were entitled to the benefit of S. 25F. Accordingly, we set aside the direction that the tribunal made for payments to Nagen Bora and Mono-haran by way of compensation."

10. In view of this decision of the Supreme Court of India, it will not be possible to hold in this case that the termination of the service of the workman with effect from 5-3-1977, amounted to retrenchment as contemplated under Section 25F of the Act and, therefore, because the provisions of that section were not complied with, the said action was illegal or void.

11. This contention raised on behalf of the workman having failed, it will have to be examined whether, apart from that contention, the action of the bank in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5-3-1977, was otherwise legal and proper? The bank has not produced the original order under which the workman was appointed with effect from 1-5-1976. However, at the time of arguments Shri Oza, the learned representative appearing on behalf of the bank, had clearly stated, and admitted, that the said order of his appointment must have been for temporary appointment and that also only for a period of one month. His vehement argument was that the workman was at all times only a temporary employee of the bank. In this connection, by way of an example, two other appointment orders have been produced by the bank in respect of the workman. They are the order, dated 11th August, 1977, (Ex. 10/4), and the order, dated 12th September, 1977, (Ex. 10/2). Both these orders indicate that his appointment was made for a period of only one month and that his appointment was purely a temporary one. Those orders also very specifically stated that since the appointment was purely a temporary one, it would automatically come to an end on the expiry of one month for which the said appointment was made. Relying on these facts, as evidenced by these two appointment orders, it was urged by Shri Oza on behalf of the bank that since the workman was employed only on purely temporary basis, his services came to an end on the expiry of that temporary period of employment and, therefore, the bank cannot be said to have violated any provisions of Shastri Award, or any other rules and regulations that may be applicable to the employees of the bank. There is no dispute that the employees of the bank, so far their conditions of service are concerned, are governed by the provisions of Shastri Award. Before citing the relevant provisions from that award, in order to examine the legality and validity of the action of the bank in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5-3-1977, let me refer to one other fact which has been borne out from the details given by the bank itself regarding the service history of the workman. In para (5) of its written statement on page (3), the bank has asserted as under :—

"Thereafter whenever need to appoint temporary Farrash-cum-messenger arose the employee was appointed on the temporary basis for a limited period and he was relieved at the end of that period....."

This assertion on the part of the bank means that whenever the workman was being appointed temporarily for a specific period, his services used to be terminated actually on the expiry of that period for which he was specifically appointed. Now, the details given by the bank itself do not support this assertion. The very first appointment of the workman under

the bank, was with effect from 1-5-1976, and according to the averments of the bank itself, the said appointment was purely temporary for a period of only one month. If that is so, the services of the workman should have been terminated on the expiry of one month from 1-5-1976 on 31st May, 1976, or at the most with effect from 1-6-1976. The record shows that his services were terminated only on 28th June, 1976, i.e., he was continued for 26 days more than the period for which he was specifically appointed. The said record further shows that after some period for which he had remained out of employment, he was again appointed on 1-8-1976, obviously on a temporary basis for a period of one month, but his services were not terminated on 31st August, 1976, but they were continued upto 28th September, 1976, and were terminated only on 29th September, 1976. Again, after some period of unemployment, he was re-appointed with effect from 1-11-1976, but his services were not terminated on 30th November, 1976, or 1st December, 1976, on the expiry of one month, but they were terminated on 31st December, 1976, which would show that his services were continuous for a period of two months. Coming now to the last termination, which is the subject matter of scrutiny by this Tribunal in this reference, the workman was re-appointed with effect from 6-1-1977. He remained in continuous service upto 5-3-1977, which would show that he served continuously for two months. From these recorded facts, it becomes fully established that when the services of the workman were terminated on 5-3-1977, he had remained in continuous service for two months, because his appointment immediately prior to that date was with effect from 6-1-1977. The bank has not produced the order of his appointment, which was made with effect from 6-1-1977, to indicate as to for how much period the said appointment was made. However, from the two sample appointment orders mentioned above, viz., Exs. 10/2 and 10/4, it clearly appears that every time the temporary appointment of the workman was being made only for a period of one month. Even Shri Oza, the learned representative appearing on behalf of the bank, had conceded at the time of arguments that all the temporary appointments are being made only for a period of one month. In absence of the original order of appointment on the record of this reference, it would be legitimate and proper to accept the position, that even the order of temporary appointment of the workman with effect from 6-1-1977, must be for a period of one month. If that is so, the services of the workman in that case would have automatically terminated on 5-2-1977, but in this case he continued in service for one more month upto 5-3-1977, on which date they were terminated through an oral order by the bank.

12. From these details, it becomes clear that so far the last termination is concerned, the workman had continued in service even after the expiry of the specific period of one month for which his temporary appointment was made by the bank with effect from 6-1-1977. If that is so, it will have to be found out, as to in which category of workmen, the workman can be placed after keeping in view the provisions of Shastri Award? Para (508) of Shastri Award refers to classification of employees. According to that classification, there are 4 categories of employees, viz., (a) permanent employees; (b) probationers; (c) temporary employees; and (d) part-time employees. The said para also defines those 4 categories of employees, and it will be profitable to reproduce that para (508) of Shastri Award which is as under :—

"508. Classification of employees.—We direct that employees shall be classified as :—

- (a) permanent employees;
- (b) probationers;
- (c) temporary employees; and
- (d) part-time employees;

these expressions having the following meanings :

- (a) "permanent employee" means an employee who has been appointed as such by the bank,
- (b) "probationer" means an employee who is provisionally employed to fill a permanent vacancy or post and has not been made permanent or confirmed in service,

- (c) "temporary employee" means an employee who has been appointed for a limited period for work which is of an essentially temporary nature, or who is employed temporarily as an additional employee in connection with a temporary increase in work of a permanent nature.
- (d) "part-time employee" means an employee who does not or is not required to work for the full period for which an employee is ordinarily required to work and who is paid on the basis that he is or may be engaged in doing work elsewhere."

At this state, it will also be necessary to refer to the evidence of the workman, recorded at Ex. 6. During his examination-chief, he had stated that whenever his appointment was being made in the service of the bank, the same was not being made in place of any employee having proceeded on leave. He further stated that after terminating his services, the bank had appointed another person permanently on that post. The workman has not been cross-examined on behalf of the bank and, therefore, from his evidence it becomes fully established that whenever his appointment was made even as a temporary measure for some specific period, then, too, the same was being made on a permanent post. If that is so, then, after the expiry of the period for which the workman was temporarily appointed, he ceased to be a temporary employee, but acquired the status of a 'probationer', as defined under the above mentioned para of the Shastri Award. Immediately prior to 5-3-1977, he was appointed on 6-1-1977, and that appointment being for only one month, his services would have automatically come to an end on 5-2-1977, but they were actually not terminated with effect from that date. They were continued upto 5-3-1977. His appointment, though temporary, but to fill a permanent vacancy or post, and he having ceased to be a temporary employee on the expiry of the specific period for which he was appointed, he undoubtedly acquired the status of a probationer. If that is so, it will have to be seen, whether the bank authorities followed the mandatory procedure prescribed under the Shastri Award in terminating the services of different categories of their employees? In this connection, a reference is invited to para (522) of the said Award. It will be necessary to reproduce even that para, which would indicate as to whether the procedure prescribed for the termination of employment, was followed by the bank in the case of the workman. The said para (522) is as under:—

"522. We now proceed to the subject of termination of employment. We give the following directions:—

- (1) In cases not involving disciplinary action for misconduct and subject to clause (6) below, the employment of a permanent employee may be terminated by three months' notice or on payment of three months' pay and allowances in lieu of notice. The services of a probationer may be terminated by one month's notice or on payment of a month's pay and allowances in lieu of notice.
- (2) A permanent employee desirous of leaving the service of the bank shall give one month's notice in writing to the manager. A probationer desirous of leaving service shall give 14 days' notice in writing to the manager. A permanent employee or a probationer shall, when he leaves service, be given an order of relief signed by the manager.
- (3) If any permanent employee leaves the service of the bank without giving notice, he shall be liable to pay the bank one month's pay and allowances. A probationer, if he leaves service without giving notice, shall be liable for 14 days pay and allowances.
- (4) The services of any employee other than a permanent employee or probationer may be terminated, and he may leave service, after 14 days' notice. If such an employee leaves service without giving such notice he shall be liable for a week's pay (including all allowances).
- (5) An order relating to discharge or termination of service shall be in writing and shall be signed by the manager. A copy of such order shall be supplied to the employee concerned.

(6) In cases of contemplated closing down or of retrenchment of more than five employees, the following procedure shall be observed:—

- (a) two month's notice of such proposed action shall be given individually to all the employees concerned, with a statement of the reasons for such proposed action;
- (b) the manager or an officer empowered in this behalf shall within the period of such notice hear any representation from the employees concerned or any registered union of bank employees;
- (c) after the hearing of such representation and the receipt of a report in the matter, if necessary, by the management, if it decides to give effect to the contemplated closing down or retrenchment in the original or an amended form the services of the employees may be terminated by giving notice or payment in lieu thereof for the periods prescribed above."

13. The workman, through his evidence at Ex. 6, has deposed that before his services were terminated with effect from 5-3-1977, he was not given any previous notice and that he was also not given any salary or pay in lieu of that notice. Even the bank itself has not even alleged that any such notice was given to him, or any pay, or salary, was paid to him in lieu of that notice. From the above mentioned para (522) of Shastri Award, it has become very clear that the services of the workman who had attained the status of a probationer, could be terminated legally only after giving him one month's notice, or on payment of a month's pay and allowance, in lieu of that notice, as contemplated under clause (1) of the said para (522). The bank had, admittedly, violated the above mentioned provisions of Shastri Award in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5-3-1977.

14. Even if it were to be accepted for the sake of arguments, that the workman had not attained the status of a probationer, but he still continued to be a temporary employee of the bank, then, too, sub-clause (4) of the said para (522) of the Shastri Award, clearly lays down that his services could have been legally terminated after giving him 14 days' notice. In this case, no such notice was given to the workman. From this discussion, it stands fully established that the action of the bank, in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5-3-1977, was absolutely illegal and unjustified.

15. It has been brought on record that even after the termination of his service with effect from 5-3-1977, the workman has been re-employed, and after that termination his first re-employment was on 11-8-1977, which continued upto 10th September, 1977. Again, he was re-employed with effect from 12th September, 1977, which employment continued upto 5th November, 1977, as would be clear from the details given by the bank at Ex. 10/1. After that termination on 5th November, 1977, the workman remained out of employment. However, it is gratifying to note that with effect from 1-8-1979, he has been taken up as a probationer on a permanent post and it was reported that after the completion of one year of service, he would be made a permanent employee of the bank. This would show that so far the prayer for reinstatement is concerned, it has now become infructuous, as the workman is already in the employment of the bank. However, the question of his past wages would undoubtedly arise. He had remained out of employment on the basis of that illegal and unjustified order with effect from 5-3-1977 to 10th August, 1977, because with effect from 11th August, 1977, he was again re-employed. The present reference is confined to the examination of the legality and the propriety of the action of the management of the bank in terminating the services of the workman with effect from only 5th March, 1977. This being the position, it will not be within the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to consider the action of the bank in terminating his services on the dates prior to that date, or subsequent to that date. I have already held above that the action of the bank authorities in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 5th March, 1977, was neither legal, nor proper. It was, therefore, not justified.

16. Having held that the said action of the bank was not justified, and considering the fact that even at present the

workman is in the employment of the bank, the only other relief which can be given to the workman, would be regarding giving directions about the continuity of his service and the payment of back wages only for the period from 5-3-1977 to 10-8-1977, which will be for about 5 months and 5 days. There is nothing on the record to show that during the said period of his unemployment the workman was gainfully employed elsewhere and during that period he had also earned any wages. The burden was upon the employer, viz., the bank in this case, to have put questions to the workman, when he was giving evidence before this Tribunal in this connection, but unfortunately he was not cross-examined at all. In absence of any such evidence, it will have to be held that he was without any other alternative employment during that period and, therefore, would be entitled to his full wages and other allowances which he would have earned during that period if he had continued in employment.

17. (i) It is hereby declared that the action of the management of the State Bank of India, L.H.O., Bhadra, Ahmedabad, in terminating the services of Shri Ramesh G. Barot, Farrash-cum-Messenger, with effect from 5th March, 1977, being in contravention of the provisions of the Shastri Award, was illegal, improper and unjustified.

(ii) The workman having already been re-employed in the service of the bank, it will not be necessary to give any directions regarding his reinstatement.

(iii) It is hereby directed that the workman be paid his wages, including all the allowances, which he was drawing on the date of the termination of his service on 5-3-1977, from that date till 10-8-1977, because with effect from 11-8-1977, he was again re-employed in the service of the bank. The arrears of those wages and other allowances, shall be paid to him within a period of one month from the publication of this award in the Gazette of India.

(iv) It is also directed that the services of the workman shall be treated as continuous with effect from 6-1-1977 and there shall be no break in his service on account of the termination of his service on 5-3-1977, which action of the bank has been held to be illegal and unjustified.

(v) The first party to bear its own costs and also to pay the costs of the second party, which are quantified at Rs. 200 (Rupees Two Hundred only).

R. C. ISRANI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/82/78-D.II.A]

Ahmedabad,
dated 5th February, 1980.

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1980

S.O. 749.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Interim award of the Central Government's National Industrial Tribunal Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India and their Class III workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 7th March, 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

C. T. Dighe Esqr., B.A. (Hons.), LL.M. Presiding Officer.

Reference No. NTB—1 of 1979

Employers in relation to Reserve Bank of India

AND

Their Class III Workmen

(Interim Award on Item 33 of Reference)

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Mr. N. V. Sundaram, Legal Adviser.

For the All India Reserve Bank Employees' Association.—
Mr. Madan Phadnis, Advocate.

For the All India Reserve Bank Workers' Organisation.—
Mr. M. P. Mehta, Advocate.

For All India Reserve Bank Karmachari Federation and All India Reserve Bank Cash Department Staff Union.—Mr. C. L. Dudhla, Advocate.

For Reserve Bank Ex-Servicemen Employees' Welfare Association.—Mr. S. P. Palani Velu.

For Reserve Bank Employees' Union (H), Reserve Bank Employees' Union (N) & All India Reserve Bank Employees' Co-ordination Committee.—Mr. J. G. Gadkari, Advocate.

For All India Reserve Bank Scheduled Caste/Tribe Employees' Federation.—Mr. Y. H. Appa, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Banking

Bombay, dated the 19th February, 1980

AWARD

The All India Reserve Bank Workers Organisation, Nagpur, hereinafter called "the Organisation" filed an application along with their Statement of Claim on the 21st of November, 1979, asking for an interim relief of Rs. 1,000 to the employees in Class III of the Reserve Bank of India. The application mentions that the prayer has been made in terms of Item No. 33 of the Schedule attached to the order of reference dated 16th June, 1979.

2. This claim was opposed by the Reserve Bank of India and the All India Reserve Bank Employees' Association, hereinafter called "the Association" by filing a combined reply. According to them, Item No. 33 of the reference which reads as "Need for Interim Relief" has a bearing on various other items which are in the nature of monetary benefits. They referred to the settlement already entered into by the management and the Association in respect of a number of items of reference, including basic pay, dearness allowance, house rent allowance and other items in the nature of monetary benefits. It is, therefore, said that in case an award is made expeditiously approving that settlement, the entire amount due under the settlement would immediately become payable to the employees. In short, therefore, they are urging for the early implementation of the settlement dated 28th September 1979, instead of granting any interim relief.

3. Subsequent to the giving of the application dated 21st November 1979, by the Organisation, time was spent in deciding the question whether other unions not named in the order of reference should be allowed to address the Tribunal. The decision on that point was given on the 7th January 1980. On 11th January 1980 the All India Reserve Bank Employees' Co-ordination Committee, hereinafter called "Co-ordination Committee" filed a Statement of Claim. Paragraph 33, of that statement headed "the need for interim relief", is in the nature of a request to this Tribunal for granting an interim relief of Rs. 1,500 pending publication of the Tribunal's award. It is stated that the last agreement on wages and other conditions of service expired on the 31st of December 1973, but since then there has been no relief to the employees of the Reserve Bank, although, in all other banks, the employees have already received interim relief and also arrears in pursuance of the revised pay scales.

4. On 14th of January 1980, the All India Reserve Bank Scheduled Caste/Tribe Employees' Federation, hereinafter called "the Federation" filed an application of similar nature. According to the applicants, prices of consumer products, including essential commodities, have steadily increased and they are still recording a rise. It is said that the reference would take a long time and the employees could not be allowed to remain in indigent circumstances. More so when the Reserve Bank of India has made no case of its inability to grant interim relief. It is, therefore, said that there being a prima facie case each employee be given a sum of Rs. 1,200 or Rs. 100 per month with effect from 16th June 1979.

5. Another prayer in this application relates to intermediately striking down the settlement between the Association and the Reserve Bank of India. That however, cannot take place

unless the merits are looked into and as such at this stage such a prayer cannot be allowed.

6. The request for interim relief will have to be looked into not only in the light of Item No. 33 in the reference, the "need for interim relief" but also on the background of a similar settlement between the Reserve Bank of India and their Class IV servants where before the implementation of the settlement an interim relief has been voluntarily granted by the Reserve Bank of India.

7. On behalf of the Organisation Mr. Mehta argued that the last agreement on wages between the management and the employees expired on the 31st of December 1973, and since then there has been a very big rise in the All India Index of Working Class Consumer Prices. He relied upon the entries at page 2343 of October 1979 issue of the Indian Labour Journal. According to the figures therein mentioned, with the base year as 1949, in 1973 the general index had risen upto 287 and by about the time we are discussing the matter, the further rise recorded in 417. Mr. Mehta, therefore, argued that there has been an erosion in the real wages. He conceded that with the rise in the price index there was an automatic rise in the dearness allowance admissible to the employees. But he says that as far as Class III employees are concerned, such rise neutralises only 75 per cent of the increase in prices and hence looking to the staggering rise in prices, even the unliquidated 25 per cent rise in prices is sufficiently painful to be borne by the employees. Pending the decision on the reference he asks for approximately Rs. 100 per month to each of the employees retrospectively from 1st September 1978, the date on which the Class IV servants are shown entitled to such a relief or in the alternative, he prays for an immediate lumpsum payment of Rs. 1,000 to each of the employees.

8. In this connection, he relied upon the decision reported in (1964) I LLJ 380, "Workmen of Balmer Lawrie Ltd. v. Balmer Lawrie Ltd.". This decision emphasises the need for re-examination of wage structure and it is said that payment of a high rate of dearness allowance is not an answer to the demand for revision of wage scales. On the same aspect, he also referred to the decision reported in (1972) I LLJ 576, "Unichem Laboratories v. Workmen", where the Supreme Court has emphasised the need for looking into the dearness allowance, incentive bonus etc. while fixing the wage structure. Mr. Mehta argued that the Reserve Bank of India has not disputed the necessity of increase inasmuch as they have entered into a settlement with the Association agreeing to pay the higher scales of wages, but, it is said that the award even in terms of the settlement would take considerable time so that by granting interim relief the situation could be retrieved substantially.

9. Mr. Gadkari appearing on behalf of the Co-ordination Committee compared his application with an application for interim order in civil courts and said that there was a good *prima facie* case in favour of the employees and the balance of convenience was also in their favour. Mr. Dudhia appearing for the Karamchari Federation, which is supporting the prayer for interim relief argued that the interim relief was in the nature of an aid to final relief and inasmuch as a *prima facie* case was established by reason of the Reserve Bank of India impliedly conceding to the rise in the wage structure, immediate relief should be granted.

10. The settlement arrived at between the Association and the Reserve Bank of India provides for higher pay scales as well as other higher monetary benefits. The other unions now before me, by and large disapprove of that settlement inasmuch as, according to them something more ought to be granted. When this is the view point of the parties interested in assisting the tribunal it is easy to say that every one seeks to secure more in terms of money. If we look to the All India Consumer Price Index, it becomes evident that there has been a big increase in commodity prices and employees therefore have a good *prima facie* case for enhancing the pay scales. The pertinent question would be whether the employees should be made to wait till the Tribunal finally disposes of all the 35 items or whether something by way of a small relief in terms of money could and should be given at this stage.

11. Mr. Phadnis appearing on behalf of the Association in opposing the interim relief submitted that the very scrutiny of the settlement should start without any loss of time. He hoped that that may not take more than 30 days, and therefore he argued that there was no necessity of granting any interim relief. In fact, Shri Sundaram appearing for the Reserve Bank of India while supporting Mr. Phadnis said that the prayer for interim relief is made by the other unions more to score a point over the Association and not because they have come real need for the relief. According to him no hardship would be resuted to the employees of the Reserve Bank of India because already they are in a higher pay bracket. He told me that the lowest clerk employed at present gets Rs. 664.20 as monthly salary.

12. That there has been a very big rise in the consumer prices is not and cannot be denied by Mr. Phadnis or by Mr. Sundaram. Looking to the number of persons taking part in the proceedings and the number of items upon which the discussion is to take place first for deciding whether the settlement is just and fair and next for deciding other items not included in the settlement, it does not appear that the final decision of the Tribunal could be received within a month or so. The ground for dissenting the employees of the interim relief because there is a likelihood of early award cannot therefore be appreciated.

13. Another point made by the opposing parties in this connection related to the delay that could be caused because of the form of order. It was said that even for granting an interim relief, there will have to be an award. Such an award will have to be submitted to the Central Government who may or may not approve it and even after approval, it may take sometime for its publication. It was therefore said that instead of waiting for such publication of the award, the Tribunal should go ahead with the hearing and make a final award. I am not impressed with this argument to deny the interim relief. If on a comparatively small item of interim relief, the process involved in giving the award, submitting the same to the Government and its publication involves delay, there is likely to be far more delay considering the time required for deciding the points involved, the submission of the award to the Central Government, the Government arriving at a finding on different items and publishing the award. Therefore, that would be a stronger reason for the employees to claim an interim relief.

14. On the point whether an interim award is necessary for granting interim relief, my attention was invited to the orders made earlier on 18th August 1967 in the reference between the Reserve Bank of India and its workmen, in case No. S.O. 645 of 1967. It is said that no interim award was made and if the Bank chooses to implement the order, the question of delay does not arise. As against this, it was said that the order of interim relief is an award within the meaning of "award" as defined under Section 2(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and under Section 17 of the Act, Tribunal will have to submit its award to the appropriate Government for publication and that the award would become effective 30 days after its publication in the Gazette. A glance at the ruling in (1971) I LLJ 389 (391), "Workmen, B.S.E. Board v. B.S.E. Board" would show that the order granting interim relief has to be in the form of an interim award under clause (b) of Section 2. It seems that, that is the correct position in law.

15. However, as the same case points out, what we have to determine at this stage is whether there is a *prima facie* case in favour of the employees and whether on the facts an interim relief by way of interim award is necessary. Shri Sundaram while arguing on the merits of the case referred me to the decision in Hotel Imperial v. Hotel Imperial Employees Union, reported in (1959), 2 LLJ 542 for the proposition that the interim relief should not be the whole relief that the workmen would get if they succeed finally. He also relied upon the "Punjab National Bank v. A. N. Sen" reported in (1952) I LLJ 371 where the Simla High Court has approved the principle that the interim order can be made only in a matter of urgency.

16. We have seen that there is not only clamour for increase in pay and other allowances but in fact the Reserve Bank by entering into a settlement with the Association have in effect conceded the need for such a relief. On the point of urgency, it may be noted that the earlier agreement ended on 31st December

1973, and till today no steps have been taken for the amelioration of the situation excepting perhaps the automatic rise in the dearness allowance. But, as seen earlier by that rise there is no full neutralisation and the portion of the increase remaining without neutralisation looks to be sufficiently substantial to keep a wide gap while combating with the ever rising prices.

17. In these circumstances, it is felt that an order for interim relief ought to be passed.

18. The more material question however is the extent to which such relief can be granted. At the bar, a suggestion was made that since the Reserve Bank has already entered into a settlement, the consent of the Bank to the rise embodied in it may be taken for granted and the interim order should be formulated on those lines. Mr. Sundaram at this stage relied upon the decision in Nagereoil Electric Supply Corporation v. Industrial Tribunal, reported in (1953) 1 LLJ 208 where the Trivandrum and Cochin High Court has laid down that a settlement between the employer and workmen otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceedings cannot form the foundation for the grant of an interim relief by a tribunal. It would, however, appear that the complexion of the question is different. If any party were to claim interim relief based on the private settlement and if that claim was opposed by the contesting parties the principle enunciated would have applied. When, however, an independent scrutiny is made for finding out the appropriate amount or the appropriate manner in which the interim relief could be granted and for the sake of comparison or for the sake of guidance a figure or figures are indicated as found in the settlement the principle as stated in the decision would not seem to have application. In other words, the settlement would not be made the basis of the interim relief, interim relief would be founded independently but certain statements of the management is embodied in the settlement which could easily be looked upon as admission on the point concerned could be utilised for formulating the order.

19. In this context the tabular statement submitted to me by the Organisation analysing the rise in different scales would be helpful for concluding as to how much is looked upon as appropriate amount for giving relief against the rise in prices. We can also derive help from the order passed by the Reserve Bank of India on 12th January 1980, when interim relief was granted to Class IV servants preceding the implementation of the settlement arrived at between the Reserve Bank and the Union of Class IV employees. That relief was granted retrospectively from 1st September 1978 and a provision is also made for relief to be given to the employees appointed in service after 1st September 1978, but remaining in service till 31st December, 1979. The amount of relief granted to Class IV employees is of course in relation to the scales of pay available to them but the lumpsum amount granted to them cannot be said to be of absolutely no use in making a comparison and coming to a conclusion about the interim relief to be granted in this particular case.

20. It may be expressed that the retrospective effect given from 1st September 1978 to the Class IV servants could be made to govern our case also. Again it seems that instead of giving a monthly payment and thereafter making calculations in case in the final award the scales are varied, it looks convenient to grant interim relief as in the case of Class IV servants in terms of some lump amount, so that it would be easier to make adjustments after the final award. The interim relief granted to the Class IV servants in different pay brackets is given in slabs related to different stages in the scales of pay. This pattern also looks convenient to be borrowed. It is on this background and keeping in view that the Reserve Bank of India has already agreed to a rise in pay, that the statement given by the Organisation to the Tribunal, will have to be looked into. This statement is based on the rise in the scale of pay agreed by the Reserve Bank and embodied in the private settlement. The relief sought is divided into four slabs. The first slab ends with the 7th stage in the scale of pay, the second slab ends with the 12th stage in the scale, the third slab ends with the 16th stage and the last slab ends with the 20th stage. The statement is prepared on the basis of the relief for 16 months from 1st September 1978. As a matter of fact, two more months have elapsed and therefore my final order would be in terms of 18 months ending with February 1980. The statement shows a rise of Rs. 31.40 in the first slab, Rs. 50 in the second slab,

Rs. 70 in the third slab and Rs. 100 in the fourth slab. Independent of the objection that the interim relief cannot be founded on a private settlement, which I have already dealt with, keeping in view the other principle that the interim relief should not be the whole relief, I would prefer to take the amount of increase not at Rs. 100 for the 4th slab, or at Rs. 70 for the third slab, but by reducing it by Rs. 10 in the fourth slab, and Rs. 5 in the third slab, at Rs. 90 for the fourth slab and Rs. 65 for the third slab. As far as the second slab is concerned, looking to the pay range covered by it, as given in the settlement supplied by the Reserve Bank of India, I think, the amount of Rs. 50 as the rise should be kept as it is. The first slab represents the employees in the still lower scale; the minimum rise there estimated is at Rs. 31.40. I would like to round it off to Rs. 30. Consequently, the final order for interim relief for the eighteen months period from 1st September 1978 will be Rs. 540 to the persons in the first slab, Rs. 900 to the persons in the second slab, Rs. 1,170 to the persons in the third slab and Rs. 1,620 to the persons in the fourth slab. I am also borrowing the pattern in the letter dated 12th January 1980 granting the relief to Class IV servants and hence some provision will have to be made in respect of the employees who have joined after 1st September 1978. They would be at the bottom of the grade and therefore the relief to which they would be entitled is Rs. 30 per month of their service till the end of the 18 months period.

Resumed 26th February 1980

21. When the proposed order was discussed and counsel appearing for different Unions were invited to say whether the order will be workable or whether any complications would be caused, it was gathered that Class III employees of the Reserve Bank of India are having different pay scales as appearing in Section B page 62 of the Booklet named "Settlement Regarding Scales of Pay". The starting salary in each scale is different. The benefit of the interim relief therefore would have to be regulated in terms of pay range rather than the stage in the scale. There was consensus of opinion on this aspect and as such the slabs would be in terms of pay range. The first slab would extend to the employees having a pay range less than Rs. 300 on 1-9-1978 the second slab would be of employees having a pay range from Rs. 300 but less than Rs. 435 on 1-9-1978, the third slab would be of employees with the pay range from Rs. 435 but less than Rs. 515 and the fourth slab would be of the employees getting Rs. 515 and above as on 1-9-1978.

22. My attention was also invited to another category of Class III employees who do work on part-time basis. There is no reason not to extend the benefit of interim relief to them. The part-time work as shown at page 39 of the Booklet above referred to, covers persons whose working hours per week are 6 hours to 13 hours, more than 13 hours to 19 hours and more than 19 hours to 29 hours. These employees draw wages at 1/3, 1/2 and 3/4 respectively of the scale of wages for the whole time employees. The relief to be granted to them could best be expressed by granting it, pro rata the input in service.

23. It was said that certain Class III employees would be employees promoted from Class IV. I suppose however, the Classification A & B in the order proposed should be able to take care of such employees.

24. I was also addressed on the question of interim relief to be granted to those who are under suspension. The present rules governing suspension do not justify making any provision for them. I also gather there are very few such cases. I am not therefore inclined to pass any orders granting them interim relief.

25. As remarked earlier this interim relief will be subject to adjustment after the final award is passed.

26. On the discussion I also find it advisable to permit the Reserve Bank of India to ask for direction in specific cases not governed by the orders already passed in which the Reserve Bank feels that a particular type of order may be equitable. Directions will be issued during the pendency of this Reference as and when such applications if any are given by the Reserve Bank of India.

27. Consequently, the following order is passed :—

ORDER

The Reserve Bank of India do pay by way of interim relief to their Class III employees amounts as indicated in the following schedule :—

SCHEDULE

(A) Employees who were in the service of the Bank as on 1st September 1978 and continue to be in service till 29th February 1980 ;

Pay range as on 1-9-1978	Total amount Rs.
(a) Less than Rs. 300	540
(b) From Rs. 300 but not more than Rs. 435	900

Rs.	
(c) From Rs. 435 but not more than Rs. 515	1,170
(d) From Rs. 515 and above	1,620

(B) Employees appointed in the Bank's service on or after 1st September 1978 and in service upto 29th February 1980 at the rate of Rs. 30 per month of service till 29th February, 1980 ;

(C) Part-time Employees.—Interim relief pro rata, wages they receive depending upon their weekly hours of work and in terms of Class A or Class B as appearing above.

C. T. DIGHE, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12025/21/79-D.II(A)]

S. K. BISWAS, Desk Officer